

SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW OF MISSION STATEMENT
AND PREPARATION OF DEPARTMENTAL PLANS
1976-77

<u>Steps</u>	<u>Dates</u>
1. Review of draft of general document by Deans and EPC	July 21-August 18
2. Revision of draft	August 18-27
3. Review of draft by all academic and administrative units, EPC, Senate Executive Committee, and appropriate external agencies or groups	September 3-October 15
4. Final revision of general document	October 15-29
5. Preparation of goals, objectives, and three-year plans by academic and administrative units	October 1-January 10
6. Review and discussion of three-year plans	January 10-April 1
7. Budget allocation decisions for 1978-79	April 1-May 1
8. Begin 1978-79 budget request process to SUNY-Central	May 15

A PROPOSED STATEMENT OF MISSION
FOR THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

A Draft Statement Submitted for
Review and Response

July, 1976

CONTENTS

	Page
PART I: INTRODUCTION	1
PART II: MAJOR FORCES AFFECTING FUTURE MISSION	7
PART III: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	19
PART IV: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT	25
PART V: ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND PRIORITIES	30
PART VI: ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND PRIORITIES	41
PART VII: TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION	49

PART I

INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth a proposed statement of mission for the University at Albany. It is tentative and incomplete in its present form and will be distributed to appropriate groups and individuals both on and off the campus for reaction and response. The document is incomplete in that it does not contain specific school or department plans for the future. As explained more fully in Part V, those plans will be developed during 1976-77 and ultimately appended to this document.

As used here, the term "mission" refers to the goals, objectives, programs, and priorities of the institution as a whole. These are first-order decisions which define what the institution should do rather than how it should be done. A complete plan must address both formulative and implemental questions, of course, but it is important to separate the two initially. Full discussion of future direction can be more effectively accomplished if unfettered by issues which are important to, but derivative of, the more basic questions.

The evolution of the Albany campus is traced briefly below to establish the historical context in which future-oriented decisions are to be made. Part II of the report then examines the four major forces affecting future mission. A rather detailed list of goals and objectives is presented in Parts III and IV, with emphasis on the end results which we should seek to achieve as a major institution of higher learning. Part V focuses on the academic program offerings and priorities for the next three years and establishes the basic framework for program planning within schools and departments. A brief discussion of administrative functions and priorities is presented in Part VI, with emphasis on the major actions to be taken to facilitate the work of faculty. Finally,

Part VII discusses the major steps which must be accomplished in order to move toward implementation of mission and thus develop a comprehensive action plan for the future.

Historical Development: 1844 - 1962

The University at Albany has a rich and eventful past. Founded in 1844 as the State Normal School (later changed to New York State Normal College), the institution's primary purpose for its first 60 years of existence was the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1905, the mission changed dramatically: all courses of study designed to prepare elementary school teachers were discontinued; admissions requirements were made essentially the same as those of other eastern colleges of good standing; and, most importantly, all students were required to pursue subjects deemed essential to a liberal education. Also in 1905, the institution was authorized to award the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Thus the College sought to prepare, first, a liberally educated person and, second, a professionally competent teacher for the secondary schools. A strong focus on quality education was evident throughout this period.

In 1948, along with all other public institutions, the College became a part of the newly established State University of New York (SUNY). Its primary mission remained unchanged, however, and it was not until September, 1961, that the College enrolled its first class of undergraduate students in a liberal arts program which did not include any required study in teacher education. In 1962, the institution was designated as one of four major university centers to be developed in the SUNY system and thus began the rapid transition from a single-purpose college to its present role as a major university.

The Growth Era: 1962 - 1971

In the decade following its designation as a university center, the Albany campus experienced rapid growth in program offerings, enrollments, and resources. The number of academic departments tripled, enrollments and faculty quadrupled, library holdings increased tenfold, and a new physical plant was constructed and occupied. The growth was more than numeric and physical, of course, and the sense of quality expected of a major university permeated decisions made on program development, faculty recruitment, and student admissions. Visible evidence of the emphasis placed on quality during the growth era can be seen in the test scores of entering students, the scholarly achievements of faculty, and the high demand for admission at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The initiation of a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in a later period (March, 1974) finds its roots in the insisted emphasis on quality throughout the University's first decade.

The rather sudden change in role, and hence in expectations of the campus, necessitated expansion on a broad front. The range of programs appropriate to a major university had to be developed rapidly and in a constricted time frame. Aspirations were defined at a high level and, with few exceptions, were realized. The quantitative and qualitative elements of growth were mutually reinforcing, and the University was in many ways a product of the munificence of the times and the esteem in which higher education was held. By the end of this decade of growth, the University was offering 49 baccalaureate programs, 52 master's programs, and 28 at the doctoral level - a remarkable achievement given the level of quality which was also attained in many programs.

Thus the dominant feature of the era was growth, not unplanned or undirected expansion, but growth on the broad front of program activity necessitated by the times. Little attention had to be given the question of institutional mission under such expansionist conditions, as the problem of choice had an additive dimension only - decisions on which programs to add and/or expand were made only at the expense of not adding and/or expanding some other programs. The general definition of a university center provided adequate guidance in that era. When steady-state conditions emerged rather abruptly in the early 1970's, few institutions were prepared to adjust to the prospect of equilibrium or of decline in program activity - and the University at Albany was no exception.

The Recent Past: 1971 - Present

Only with fulfillment of the grim predictions of steady-state financing have institutions begun to seriously address the question of mission and priorities. The University at Albany began earlier than most, adopting redeployment strategies in the early 1970's to cope with shifts in workload patterns which resulted from elimination of all distribution requirements. The redeployments were ad hoc in nature, however, and were based on a narrow assessment of the circumstances peculiar to one or more programs at the time, rather than being guided by a more comprehensive plan for institutional development.

The work of the Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities in 1975 represented a significant break with the past pattern of sequential redeployment. That group made recommendations with regard to position redeployments and program cuts within a single iterative process, i.e., all programs were examined together, and no single recommendation was made final prior to an examination of the whole. The work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources in early 1976 continued the pattern of making resource allocation decisions in simultaneous, rather than sequential, fashion.

While neither the Select Committee nor the Presidential Task Force was charged with delineating long-range developmental priorities for the campus, the work of both focused attention on the need for such a plan. The Educational Policy Council also recognized the need for a "coherent institutional plan" in its review of the Task Force's report. It has become apparent to all that the times have changed, and that our future development must be guided by more than a broad and generally unstated sense of university purpose. We, and others like us, are in a critical period. If institutions of higher education are to effectively use the increasingly scarce resources available to them, decisions about those resources must reflect prior decisions on goals, objectives, and developmental priorities. Thus we must not only be more selective in our choices as to what is important, but also ensure that those choices are subsequently reflected in budgetary decisions.

The following pages offer a proposed statement of mission to guide our future activities as a major university center. The intent is to develop an institutional direction which at once provides a commonality of purpose and preserves the rich diversity of the intellectual enterprise. The future is uncertain but challenging - we must move boldly and prepare well.

PART II

MAJOR FORCES AFFECTING FUTURE MISSION

The future mission and priorities of the University at Albany must be shaped in response to four interrelated forces:

- Its role as a university center within the SUNY system, and hence its designation as an institution devoted to the highest order of learning.
- The needs and opportunities inherent in the immediate environment -- the State Capital District and this geographic region of New York State.
- The internal strengths and resources of the institution -- human, financial, and physical.
- The premise that all programs and activities undertaken must meet that standard of quality appropriate to a national and international university.

Each of the above forces has significant implications for the future development of the campus and will be discussed separately below.

The Concept of a University Center

There are four university centers within the SUNY system: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook. These campuses, while themselves different in many ways, share several common features which distinguish them from the four-year colleges, the community colleges, and other units within SUNY:

- The offering of a broad range of programs encompassing the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional schools.
- Development and maintenance of high quality doctoral, masters, and other advanced degree programs which strengthen and reinforce undergraduate offerings in the disciplines and professional fields.
- A balanced emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of the two activities and excellence in each.
- A significant proportion of graduate and advanced professional students.

- An enrollment mix which maintains an appropriate balance among in-state, out-of-state, and foreign students.
- Program offerings and content geared in part to a national market at necessarily national levels of quality.
- An intellectual climate for students dominated by the focus on advanced education of high quality.

These common features of the four university centers establish a context for their work which is distinctly national and international in character. They are institutions devoted to the highest order of learning and, as such, are obligated to the advancement of knowledge on behalf of the society at large and to the attainment of excellence in both teaching and research as measured by rigorous standards of scholarship. These features, in turn, require faculty of strong intellectual competence; performance expectations appropriate to a first-class university; and a shared commitment on the part of all faculty and staff to the discovery, application, and transmittal of knowledge on behalf of students and society.

At the same time, the University at Albany also serves many local and regional needs:

- Although many out-of-state and foreign students are also enrolled, its full- and part-time student population is drawn heavily, and broadly, from New York State.
- It offers a variety of life-long learning programs directed at the population within its geographic region.
- It applies the expertise of its faculty and staff to problems and/or issues arising locally, but which also are of concern nationally and internationally.
- It offers a variety of cultural, clinical, and other activities or services which directly benefit area residents but which also contribute to the intellectual development of students.

One frequently hears universities described as local, regional, or national, yet the criteria for such distinctions are rarely made explicit. Despite this ambiguity, the view persists that an institution must choose whether it is to be a "great university" or merely a local one. This view must be rejected for three reasons. First, the very essence of a major university is its commitment to the discovery of knowledge, regardless of whether the immediate benefit to society is measurable or immeasurable, tangible or intangible, long-run or short-run. The advancement of knowledge is a primary goal of all disciplines and fields of study and herein lies the greatest contribution to both the local community and the nation - if for no other reason than that the application and transmittal of knowledge could not be accomplished without a strong discovery base. When viewed in this way, the national and local dimensions of a university's work are mutually reinforcing and, in behavioral terms, inseparable.

Second, it is rare that the important issues and problems existing in one geographic region are of only nominal concern to another. Thus the expertise of a university can be brought to bear on problems which, although arising locally, are of universal concern. The application of knowledge to such problems can yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty, as well as to the local community.

Finally, the greatness of a university is not judged by scholars in terms of the types of problems or concepts being addressed, but rather by the quality of the address itself - the soundness of the methodologies employed and the degree to which conclusions are supported

by the evidence. If the twin conditions of universality and research-ability are present, problems arising locally present unique opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge and for dissemination of the research results to students, scholars and practitioners. The issue of a "national" versus "local" focus then becomes moot, as the obligations intrinsic to both can be fulfilled. A university center can, and must, meet both sets of expectations if it is to provide leadership as a public institution of higher learning in New York State.

External Needs and Opportunities

Every university has a set of goals and objectives which guides its work, either explicitly or implicitly. And certainly a large majority of the goals and objectives at any given institution are shared by all others. For example, the goals and objectives for student development presented in Part III of this document could apply to any major university. The language may vary, but the desired intellectual attributes of graduates are essentially the same across all institutions of higher learning.

At the same time, each institution has a distinctive element of mission, an additive component which serves to differentiate it from others. That distinctiveness may be expressed in a variety of ways, as each institution seeks to match its strengths and resources with the needs of society. All great universities are in some sense specially attuned to their own geography, and location in the Capital District of New York presents unique needs and opportunities to the University at Albany and many of its programs. The existing

and potential strengths of the University, in turn, constitute a major resource for governmental, industrial, cultural, and other organizations. How to best join our strengths and resources to the needs and opportunities inherent in the environment is a pivotal issue in defining the campus mission.

The University addresses many external needs and problems already, of course, and in a variety of ways. Applied research on problems of concern to government and other agencies; life-long learning programs for area residents; technical consulting assistance to various organizations; student internships in the community; evening classes to improve educational access; the provision of qualified graduates - these and other forms of service to the community are important and will continue. However, they are forms of service legitimately expected of any major public university, regardless of its location. Therefore, the distinctiveness of the University at Albany's mission is not to be found in those services generally performed by all universities, but rather in those additional programs and activities which can be directed toward the needs and opportunities unique to our location.

We obviously cannot meet all the needs or capitalize on all the opportunities available to us. In order to define an institutional thrust for the future, then, choices must be made among the various types of issues and problems which legitimately could be given high priority. Where should we place our emphasis - our priorities - in order to fulfill this distinctive element of university mission? The answer lies partially in our role as a university center, partially in our

unique location, and partially in the internal strengths which we possess now and have the potential to enlarge. In short, the emphasis should lie in addressing the issues and problems of major concern to State government and to us all.

What are the types of issues and problems of major concern to the State? Economic development, certainly, and related policy matters in the areas of taxation, regulation, public finance, industrial development, and energy use. Social, technological, and scientific problems of similar magnitude exist in education, environmental management, social services, health care, corrections, and other areas. In addressing such problems, agency heads, legislators and other government officials are charged, as representatives of the people, with (a) developing appropriate goals for enhancement of the public good, (b) defining and implementing the appropriate means (programs and procedures) for achieving those goals and (c) monitoring the results and taking corrective action where necessary. Regardless of the specific area of concern (e.g., health care delivery, social services, education), fulfillment of these general responsibilities requires a strong undergirding of research and training in a variety of forms. It is within this context that the University's functions of discovery, application, and transmittal can fruitfully intersect the process of policy formation not through direct involvement in decision-making or implementation, but through generation of the knowledge needed to support the process.

In no way does this emphasis on the public sector mean a lessening of concern for those disciplines and fields which, by their nature, have little intellectual kinship with such issues and problems. We must preserve and nurture those disciplines which are essential for

education of the whole person and be satisfied with nothing less than excellence there also. We are first and foremost a university center, and we must therefore provide all units with the resources needed to achieve that level of quality befitting a national university. The emphasis on matters of public policy is an additive concern, an enlargement of mission to embrace the unique needs and opportunities inherent in our immediate environment.

There are at least four reasons for the emphasis on public policy analysis. First, adoption of this unique thrust can be accomplished in a way which reinforces that element of mission which we share with all other universities - developing the intellectual capacities of students and discovering, applying, and transmitting knowledge. There are educational benefits to be gained for both students and faculty, as well as opportunities for the advancement of knowledge on a variety of fronts. Second, the economic, social, and technological problems facing this State are not unique. Other regions of the nation and world have, or will have, many of the same concerns.

Third, and building on the first two points, a concentrated focus on major policy issues can contribute importantly to the local area, while in no way compromising the national and international character of this university. As indicated earlier, scholars judge a university in terms of the quality of its research and teaching activities and in terms of the significance of the problems being studied, neither of which need be compromised by this unique thrust.

Finally, our existing faculty expertise and interests provide a strong base for further development. We have the potential to

enlarge that base and thus to provide the support required for this element of mission.

Much of our work in policy analysis will be conducted on an individual basis, as faculty members initiate and pursue specialized projects of their own choosing. If we are to fully effect this element of mission, however, we must also establish and maintain appropriate liaison relationships with agency heads and other government officials to identify mutually beneficial projects. The mechanism for facilitating such relationships will be discussed more fully in Part VI of this document.

It is, clearly, the role of the faculty to define the content and methodology of specific research efforts, regardless of the discipline or field. From a University-wide perspective, however, it is desirable to establish broad criteria as to what areas are most appropriate for attention. In general, the policy issues and problems should meet the following criteria in order to be appropriate for address in the university setting:

1. The issues and problems should be amenable to the application of rigorous research methodologies and techniques.
2. They should not be so narrowly defined as to preclude the derivation of generalizable conclusions.
3. The benefits to be realized from address of the problems and issues should be of sufficient importance to society to warrant our commitment.
4. Address of the issues and problems should yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty.

5. The University should possess the expertise necessary for successful address of the issues and problems, or have the potential for attracting such expertise.

If the above criteria are met, the national and local dimensions of the University's work should indeed be mutually reinforcing.

Internal Strengths and Resources

The human, financial, and physical resources of the institution present both opportunities and constraints for our future mission.

On the constraints side, we must assume the following:

- There will be only slight growth in the total enrollment on this campus. The SUNY Master Plan currently allows for growth to 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85, or seven percent above the current level.
- There will be little or no increase in the number of faculty and staff positions funded by the State in the foreseeable future.
- The physical capacity of the University at Albany will remain virtually unchanged, although there will be some flexibility to change the character of existing space.
- Increases in the operating budget of the institution will likely be limited to inflationary adjustments over the next few years.

Thus the institution must prepare itself for a future which is "steady-state" insofar as the quantitative elements of growth. If managed properly, however, there are significant resource-related opportunities available to us:

- A limitation on total enrollments means that our attention can be centered on the qualitative aspects of growth, unfettered by erratic workload patterns and the usual crises associated therewith.
- Although the total number of faculty funded by the State may remain constant, there will be the flexibility for continued reallocation of positions.

- There are many first class programs and faculty now present on this campus. Selective development on a more compact operating front can expand those strengths still further. Although we must build from existing strengths, other programs critical to future mission will be improved where feasible.
- Our present physical capacity is sufficient, by and large, for the projected enrollments on this campus. With careful management of the space available, appropriate reallocations can be accomplished. Moreover, the quality of the physical plant is, by most yardsticks, excellent.
- While we may see no increases in the total operating budget aside from inflationary adjustments, there is flexibility for reallocation in this area also. By no means is our operating budget so small as to prevent the selective development of excellence on this campus.

The opportunities and constraints delineated above have several additional implications for future mission. First, future resource allocation decisions must be guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future. We can no longer expand on an even-handed basis, nor can all programs be developed to equivalent levels of quality. Second, we must increase our efforts at obtaining funds from non-State sources. New financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support for students and for faculty research, and to support the further development of selected programs. Third, the budgeting process of the future must be strongly influenced by a reallocative approach, with the major objective being to provide those resources necessary for attainment of the goals established. Finally, we must intensify our efforts to identify alternative ways by which costs can be reduced without corresponding reductions in effectiveness.

Quality

The final major force affecting future mission is our continuing obligation to offer only those programs which meet high standards of quality. We cannot, of course, expect all programs to attain equivalent levels of quality, but we can and must expect all programs to achieve a level of quality befitting a national university. As discussed more fully in Part V, all programs must be provided those resources needed to achieve and/or maintain an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments. In addition, resources must be provided as necessary to those programs which are capable of attaining positions of national leadership in selected disciplines and fields.

Summary and Conclusions

The major forces discussed in this section provide the underpinnings for defining the future mission of the University at Albany. The major planning premises which emerge are summarized below:

- The concept of a university center establishes a national and international context for the University's work, as well as an obligation to the local community. SUNYA must meet both sets of expectations and in a mutually reinforcing way. If problems arising locally are researchable and are of generalizable concern, the address of such problems is consistent with the role of a national university.
- All major universities have the enduring obligation to discover, apply, and transmit knowledge. An unique emphasis at the University at Albany will be on the application of knowledge to policy issues of public concern, with no lessening of concern for the other functions and programs essential to a first class university.

- The University must become more outward-looking in its mission and contribute to the solution of important societal issues and problems. The issues selected for address must meet certain criteria in order to ensure that both the community and the University are served well. Special attention will be given to addressing the problems of greatest concern to State government.
- Given a context of limited resources, the University must expand in a selective fashion, guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future and by continuing efforts to achieve greater cost/effectiveness in our work.
- In making priority choices, the University must build on existing strengths. All programs to be continued must meet that minimal standard of quality appropriate to a national and international university.
- An unique focus for future growth will be those disciplines and programs with high potential for aiding in the analysis of public problems. This emphasis will be accomplished without detrimental effects to those programs essential to any major university.

The next two sections of this document set forth goals and objectives to guide the future of the University at Albany. Part III focuses on goals and objectives for student development, emphasizing those end results of the learning process which we seek to accomplish. Part IV delineates goals and objectives focused more squarely on societal development and thus on the end results sought from the discovery, application, and transmittal of knowledge.

PART III

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

A statement of goals and objectives for student development should identify the desired outcomes, or results, of the learning process. In adopting this outcomes orientation, one must distinguish between the ultimate consequences of achieving the goals and the goals themselves. Achievement of whatever goals are set should contribute to the ability of students to (1) function effectively as educated persons in society; (2) engage in meaningful and productive careers; (3) assume the responsibilities of both leadership and citizenship within society; and (4) engage in a life-long learning process of self-development. However, these consequences are a function of many variables which are either beyond the scope of a university's work or beyond its control. Thus a university cannot, indeed should not, assume full responsibility for the life success or failure (however defined) of its graduates. The university must, however, assume the responsibility for facilitating individual development through accomplishment of the goals which are adopted as its rightful obligations.

There are three types of developmental needs which we seek to meet: intellectual, career, and personal/social. Of these three, we must give the greatest attention to intellectual development, the task for which we are best qualified. Intellectual development encompasses the acquisition of both content and skills, particularly those skills of critical thinking, analysis, and

creativity. The nature of a university demands that the areas of knowledge offered be of sufficient rigor and complexity to require application of these higher-order skills. Thus students can be both "educated" and "trained," as they are being prepared for careers which demand critical thinking and reasoning skills and the ability to apply knowledge gained through general and specialized study. However, successful integration of goals set for intellectual development, on the one hand, and career development on the other cannot be accomplished in programs which are characterized by a kind of intellectual routine and which demand little of students beyond a relatively straightforward acquisition of knowledge. Such programs, while necessary to meet some specific vocational needs of society, do not fall within the role and scope of a major university center.

The personal and social development of students is, without question, inseparable from the process of intellectual development. What must be provided are opportunities for the student to develop a sense of competence, identity, and commitment - in short, a learning environment which will enhance the positive sense of self. Certainly no one would advocate a dehumanizing or completely value-free approach to intellectual development. Nor can one deny that the full embracement of life is contingent on the complete development of self. Yet despite these fundamental truths, any university must concentrate its efforts on that task for which it is best fitted - the expansion and growth of intellectual capabilities.

In terms of time, attention, and actual resource deployment, intellectual development is our dominant concern. Thus the goals for personal and social development presented below reflect a threshold, the ends which must be achieved to fulfill our larger obligations to students and to facilitate their growth as responsible individuals.

The goals and objectives stated below not only reflect our obligations as a university center, but also constitute guidelines for the design of programs and curricula. They are applicable to both undergraduate and graduate programs, although implementation strategies may vary considerably across levels and types of instruction.

GOAL I. TO DEVELOP SKILLS OF LEARNING AND CRITICAL THINKING

- A. To develop in students skills of information acquisition, reasoning and lucid communication.
- B. To develop in students the ability to integrate knowledge from a variety of perspectives.
- C. To develop in students the ability to apply alternative modes of reasoning and methods of problem solution and the ability to distinguish the logically relevant from the irrelevant.
- D. To develop in students the ability to derive and formulate general principles for clarification and explanation.

GOAL II. TO DEVELOP AND FOSTER THE PROCESS OF INTELLECTUAL DISCOVERY AND THE EXPLORATION OF THE UNKNOWN

- A. To develop in students a familiarity with the philosophies, methods and processes of research in the professional and disciplinary fields.
- B. To encourage in students intellectual curiosity, resourcefulness and enthusiasm for learning.

- C. To encourage an awareness in students of the importance of the imaginative and creative elements of intellectual endeavor.
- D. To develop in students an attitude of individuality that promotes intellectual introspection, initiative and self-assertion.

GOAL III. TO DEVELOP AN AWARENESS OF AND INTEREST IN THE BREADTH OF HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT AND CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

- A. To develop in students an understanding and historical perspective of the cultural, political, legal, scientific, and social components of societies.
- B. To develop in students an understanding of the processes and consequences of change in societies and the interrelationship of economic, technological, political, legal and social forces in change.
- C. To develop in students an understanding of the diversity of forms in which intellectual and artistic achievements have been expressed.
- D. To encourage students to develop a life-long interest in intellectual and artistic endeavors.

GOAL IV. TO DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF VALUE SYSTEMS AND OF VALUE FORMATION

- A. To develop in students an understanding of the processes and dimensions of value formation, clarification and conflict.
- B. To develop in students an understanding of the effects of values on thought and behavior.
- C. To encourage in students attitudes of personal responsibility for the consequences of applying their knowledge and skills.

GOAL V. TO DEVELOP THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS NECESSARY TO QUALIFY STUDENTS FOR ENTRY-LEVEL WORK IN APPROPRIATE FIELDS

- A. To prepare students to meet entry-level expectations in those fields of study which traditionally lead to clearly defined jobs and careers.
- B. To encourage those students in majors which traditionally have not led to clearly defined employment to develop skills which would qualify them for career entry.

- C. To provide students the opportunity to gain work experience in appropriate field(s) of study prior to graduation.

GOAL VI. TO DEVELOP THE ABILITY AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR SELECTING CAREER EMPLOYMENT

- A. To develop students' career decision-making skills.
- B. To develop an orientation toward serial careers.
- C. To develop effectiveness in seeking employment.
- D. To provide information to employment communities concerning abilities of university graduates to meet their needs.

GOAL VII. TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO ENHANCE THEIR INDIVIDUAL PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING THE EXPLORATION OF VALUES AND ETHICS

- A. To provide a comprehensive orientation, counseling and advising system including academic, personal, career, financial, health and job placement counseling.
- B. To encourage in students the formation and enhancement of a positive self-concept.
- C. To provide opportunities for students to critically examine and compare various views, experiences, and understandings of life.
- D. To provide a wide range of learning opportunities designed to enhance interpersonal communication of ideas and feelings.

GOAL VIII. TO MAINTAIN A CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT WHICH WILL FOSTER A SENSE OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- A. To demonstrate through institutional policies and practices the University's commitment to the ideals and values of social responsibility.
- B. To provide an atmosphere which will encourage students to explore and discuss contemporary social issues.
- C. To provide opportunities for students to participate in and be exposed to a wide variety of cultural events.

- D. To provide opportunities for students to participate in University decision-making processes.
- E. To provide opportunities for students to participate in community activities and governmental processes.

GOAL IX. TO ENSURE THE SAFETY OF STUDENTS AND PROVIDE THOSE SERVICES AND FACILITIES WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL TO THEIR PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

- A. To ensure the safety of students in on-campus laboratory, classroom and extracurricular activities and in facilities used for living, eating and leisure.
- B. To provide those facilities and personnel needed to diagnose and restore to normal physical well-being students whose problems are temporary and/or minor, and in serious cases, to make responsible references.
- C. To create and maintain a healthy, clean, and psychologically and physically supportive campus environment for the entire University community.
- D. To provide adequate facilities to allow the University community various forms of physical exercise and recreation.
- E. To maintain and improve the quality of housing facilities and services.

Consistent with the obligations to students expressed earlier, the wording of the goals and objectives conveys our primary concern for intellectual development, while also setting forth the needed emphasis on career and personal/social development. While the strategies for achievement of the goals may vary across fields of study and even across specific courses, the desired outcomes apply to all graduates of the University at Albany. As discussed later in this document, all academic and administrative units will be asked to articulate goals and objectives which, while reflective of the unique discipline or field, are also compatible with the institutional goals outlined above.

PART IV

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT

The three basic functions of any major university are the discovery, application, and transmittal of knowledge on behalf of students and society. The functions are interrelated, of course, and they are accomplished through the activities of teaching, research, and consultation -- all resulting in service to society. In this sense, "public service" is an outcome, or end result, of all our work and not some separately identifiable set of activities as commonly presumed. An adequate conceptualization of the service phenomenon is long overdue in universities everywhere and necessary for full understanding of future mission. The following paragraphs discuss briefly the primary service outcomes associated with the three major functions.

The benefits or services to society resulting from the discovery of knowledge are frequently unknown or unpredictable in any immediate sense, and even more difficult to measure. On the other hand, much knowledge discovered in universities has immediate visibility and utility to society. In general, discovery has the primary service outcome of advancement of knowledge, the visibility of which varies by discipline and field, but the importance of which has been demonstrated innumerable times.

With regard to the application of knowledge, the service outcomes emerge from a problem-oriented focus, primarily through the activities of research and consultation. Thus, whereas the

discovery function tends to be concept-oriented, the application function focuses more on specific concerns of society. The distinction is often vague at best, and little is to be gained by attempting to too finely classify various types of research as "basic" or "applied." Nonetheless, the conceptual distinction is useful, particularly when addressing the larger issue of a university's service role to society. In general, the service outcome of the application function can be thought of as problem analysis, putting to work the varied resources of the university on important concerns of society or components thereof.

Finally, the transmittal of knowledge has clearly identifiable service outcomes to society. In some forms, of course, the transmittal of knowledge is indistinguishable from its application, if one assumes that participants in the application process learn rather than merely consume the results. Similarly, the university has an obligation to disseminate the results of its discovery efforts to students, the scholarly community, and the general public, another example of the interrelatedness of the basic functions in practice. As conceived here, however, transmittal occurs primarily through the teaching activity, whether that activity be for degree or non-degree students. Thus the primary outcome of transmittal is an educated citizenry. In order to enhance the quality of education, however, other outcomes may emerge in the form of cultural and clinical services to society. For example, student internship programs of various types not only enhance learning, but also provide direct assistance to individuals and

organizations in the local area. Similarly, productions or exhibits in the fine arts contribute importantly to student development and at the same time provide a valuable cultural resource for area residents.

In summary, the interrelated functions of discovery, application, and transmittal generate four major outcomes for society: advance-ment of knowledge, problem analysis, educated people, and cultural and clinical services. "Public service" as used here is the over-arching construct which embraces the four types of outcomes. The analysis of public policy issues is only one form of problem analysis which, in turn, is only one of the four principal components of public service rendered by any major university.

A university center by its very nature is engaged in the discovery, application, and transmittal of knowledge in a variety of disciplines and professional fields, and it must meet the requisite levels of quality and quantity in each. As indicated in Part II, however, the University at Albany seeks to enlarge and reinforce this traditional mission by applying its existing and potential strengths to the policy matters of major concern to State government. Thus the goals and objectives presented below reflect not only the timeless obligations of any major university, but also the unique emphasis of the Albany campus on public policy analysis.

GOAL I. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOLUTION OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS AND TO THE GENERAL ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE

- A. To encourage individual faculty to undertake research of any nature which promises to contribute to the advancement of knowledge.
- B. To educate students, through their participation in research activities, in modes of critical thought and in methods of scholarly inquiry.
- C. To significantly increase the level of financial support available for research.
- D. To support the communication of research findings to peers, students, and interested persons outside the academic community.
- E. To encourage and facilitate research on policy issues of special concern to State government.
- F. To ensure that address of various concepts, problems and issues results in benefits not only to society, but also to the educational mission of the University.
- G. To develop more effective coordinating structures for bringing discipline-based skills to bear on problems of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary character.
- H. To maintain and/or attract the faculty expertise necessary for successful address of selected issues and problems.

GOAL II. TO OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

- A. To offer degree and non-degree programs consistent with the needs of the learning society and within the capabilities and mission of the University at Albany.
- B. To provide, through course scheduling, audit capabilities, and other means, the opportunity for qualified area residents to enroll in courses offered as a part of ongoing degree programs.
- C. To encourage departments to offer life-long learning opportunities consistent with the missions of those units.
- D. To clarify and strengthen the organizational relationships of the various academic and administrative units involved in the provision of life-long learning opportunities.
- E. To implement a process that ensures quality in all life-long learning programs.

- F. To develop, where appropriate, off-campus instructional programs to meet the needs of area residents.
- G. To cooperate with other providers of life-long learning opportunities in the Capital District to ensure complementary thrusts and offerings.

GOAL III. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL AREA THROUGH THE PROVISION OF CULTURAL AND CLINICAL SERVICES WHICH REINFORCE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

- A. To provide a variety of cultural events for faculty, staff, students, and area residents.
- B. To integrate a variety of work-action experiences into curricula as appropriate and to thereby provide benefits to the local area and to students and faculty.
- C. To be involved in improving the quality of the social and physical environment.
- D. To provide technical assistance in the resolution of local problems.
- E. To make available the facilities of the University for use by appropriate community groups.
- F. To provide other appropriate services to the community which are consistent with, and reinforce, educational mission.

While the goals and objectives listed above provide a commonality of purpose for all units of the University, each contributes to their accomplishment in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of emphasis. Thus it is not intended that each unit pursue all of the objectives outlined, or even all of the goals. As an institution, however, we must be committed to the pursuit of them all and develop more effective means for assessing our degree of goal attainment.

PART V

ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND PRIORITIES

No statement of institutional mission is complete without a delineation of program offerings and priorities. The goals and objectives presented in Parts III and IV of this document are not alone sufficient to establish future direction, as there are many disciplines and fields which could contribute significantly to the attainment of those desired end results.

All universities are constrained in their range of program offerings for both educational and economic reasons. The reduction of twenty degree programs on the Albany campus this past year reflected a shared realization that an inventory of 129 programs could not be supported at the requisite level of quality in the years ahead. The range of programs sustained is befitting of a university, however, and the work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources left the institution wholesomely formed for the future.

The Task Force members did not have the benefit of a written statement of mission to guide their deliberations. Nonetheless, there was ready comprehension of the general future of this University, especially its role as a major university center, the nature of any university's obligations to students and to society, and the increasing attention to be given to policy issues of public concern. The criteria used for program evaluation constitute evidence of this understanding,

as does the final report itself. Consequently, what is needed now is not a reevaluation of the Task Force's recommendations, but rather a coalescing of their work and the information on which it was based into a statement of future program offerings and priorities for resource allocation. The time horizon selected is three years, or through 1979-80, with the understanding that the plan should be updated at least annually to reflect the latest information available on program needs and resource availability.

Program Offerings

The President's Report on Priorities and Resources, dated March 15, 1976, set forth the programs to be sustained on the Albany campus. As indicated in Exhibit 1, the inventory includes 41 programs at the bachelor's level, 47 at the master's level, 21 at the doctoral level, and eight University certificate programs.

The program array represents a rich diversity of disciplines and fields, encompassing the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional schools. Accompanying the diversity is a high degree of intellectual interdependence, of course, and a shared commitment to those values and principles of scholarly inquiry which are at the very heart of a university and know no discipline bounds. From a campus-wide perspective, there are four major expectations of all programs being sustained:

- Achievement of a level of quality befitting a university of the first class, as measured by rigorous national standards of scholarship. As established in Part II of this document, all programs must aspire to the attainment of excellence in both instruction and research if the purposes of a university center are to be attained.

EXHIBIT I
PROGRAM OFFERINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

Bachelor's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (16)
Art, Chinese, Classics (Greek, Latin, and Greek & Roman Civilization), English, French, German, Judaic Studies, Linguistics, Music, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communications, Russian, Spanish, Theatre

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (11)
African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Asian Studies, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Puerto Rican Studies, Russian and E. European Studies, Social Studies, Sociology

Division of Science & Mathematics: (9)
Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science & Applied Math, Earth Science, Geology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Physics

School of Education: (1)

School of Business: (2)
Accounting, Business Administration

School of Public Affairs: (1)
Political Science

School of Social Welfare: (1)

Master's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (12)
Classics (Classical Archaeology, Greek, and Latin), English, French, German, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communications, Russian, Spanish, Studio Art, Theatre

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (8)
African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Social Studies, Sociology

Division of Science & Mathematics: (7)
Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics

School of Education: (12)
Counseling, Curriculum Planning, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Psychology, General Professional, Reading, Rehabilitation Counseling, Special Education, Student Personnel Services, Teacher Education, TESL - Bilingual Education

School of Business: (2)
Accounting, Business Administration

School of Library & Information Science: (1)

School of Social Welfare: (1)

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (3)
Political Science, Public Administration, Public Affairs

Doctoral Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (4)
English (Ph.D. & D.A.), German, Philosophy, Spanish

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (5)
Anthropology, Economics, History, Psychology, Sociology (temporarily suspended)

Division of Science and Mathematics: (6)
Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics

School of Education: (2)
Ph.D., Ed.D.

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (2)
Political Science, Public Administration

School of Social Welfare: (1)
(temporarily suspended)

Certificate Programs

School of Education: (7)
Counseling, Curriculum & Instruction, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Research, Reading, Student Personnel Services

School of Education and Social and Behavioral Sciences: (1)
School Psychology

- Development and pursuit of goals and objectives which reflect the unique character of the discipline or field, but which are also compatible with the overall goals and objectives of the University. The institution-wide goals and objectives presented in Parts III and IV of this document provide both a commonality of purpose and a framework within which each unit can discern and articulate its own unique goals. Thus, there will be variations among units insofar as both the manner and degree of contribution to any one of the institution-wide goals and objectives, and rightfully so. It is expected, however, that the uniqueness of each unit can be articulated within the broad framework established in Parts III and IV.
- Achievement of a balanced emphasis on teaching and research. As discussed in Part II, all programs at a university center must seek a balanced emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of these two components of scholarship and excellence in each. As used here, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study. Thus, there is no single model for research, nor is there any single indicator which can be used in assessing the quality of scholarly contributions in the various disciplines and professional fields. However, one common characteristic of such activities is communication of their results to both peers and students. Thus all faculty members have an obligation to be engaged in research and scholarly activity, to communicate the results, and thereby to contribute to the intellectual development of students and colleagues and to the advancement of knowledge.
- Implementation of faculty evaluation, reward, and development plans which are appropriate to a university center. The primary responsibility for faculty evaluation rests with schools and departments. Thus each unit must specify clearly those elements of scholarship to receive primary attention in faculty evaluation; the information needed to conduct the evaluation; the process by which the information will be collected; and ways by which the information can be utilized for development of faculty as well as evaluation.

These expectations constitute the primary focal points for coordination and oversight of programs from a campus-wide perspective. The forms of scholarship to be taken as evidence of achievement will differ across academic units, of course, but there should be no

variations in the level of accomplishment expected. Continued development as a university center demands the maintenance of high performance standards for both students and faculty in all programs offered on the Albany campus.

Priorities for Resource Allocation

Estimates of resources available to academic programs over the next three years must be tempered by the uncertainty of future allocations by the State, and by the knowledge that the needs of specific programs can shift rapidly in a short period of time. The existence of such uncertainty does not make less important the need for institutional planning, however, as individual academic units must be given more adequate lead time for recruitment and internal planning in general. Uncertainty as to future events means only that we must build a degree of flexibility into planned allocations and recognize that any three-year plan may be subject to change in one or more of its parts. Thus the intent for future allocations can be clearly established, while recognizing that deviations from the plan may be necessary as external events unfold and as unanticipated needs emerge in specific programs.

There are three major factors to be considered when establishing the institution's priorities for resource allocation:

- The obligation of the institution to provide all programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.
- The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.

- The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three major factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. The question which must be given a satisfactory answer can be stated thusly: What is the critical mass of scholars and support resources needed in a given unit to (a) provide the needed breadth and depth of intellectual expertise, (b) accommodate planned enrollments, and (c) accomplish the range of intellectual activities expected of all faculty at a major university center? Some quantitative workload indices can be employed to help answer this question, but all such factors must be weighed in relation to the unique features of a given discipline or field. Judgment is involved here, certainly, but these interrelated conditions must be satisfied in all programs to be offered on the Albany campus.

As a result of shifts in student interests over the years, changes in program purposes and scope, and other factors, a number of units currently fall below the minimum level of resources required. The following departments and schools should be given a net increase in faculty lines and associated support funds as soon as is feasible to alleviate the understaffing problem:

Business	Public Administration
Computer Science	Rhetoric and Communications
Economics	Social Welfare
Psychology	Sociology

The composition of this list will vary over time, of course, as circumstances change and as units not now listed experience the need

for increased resources.

The second factor to be considered in delineating priorities takes cognizance of (a) the University's commitment to achieve peaks of excellence among its programs and (b) the obligation of the institution to facilitate and sustain extraordinary achievements on the part of its faculty. There are several academic units which have attained, or are close to attaining, national stature. Still others have strong potential to become recognized as among the leaders in the discipline or professional field. Based on external evaluations and other forms of evidence, the following units either have attained positions of national leadership already or have the potential to do so in a reasonable period of time:

Anthropology	German
Atmospheric Science	Mathematics
Biology	Philosophy
Chemistry	Physics
Criminal Justice	Public Administration
Educational Psychology	Reading
Geology	

Resource augmentation is not necessarily called for in order to facilitate the achievement and/or maintenance of very high quality in the units listed. However, the University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate. The list is not immutable, of course, and should change as developmental efforts continue in other departments.

The third factor reflects the increased emphasis to be placed by the University on the address of public policy matters. As indicated in Part II of this report, such address can take a variety

of forms and occur in numerous disciplines and fields. The following schools and departments possess special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York:

Atmospheric Science	Geography
Business	Geology
Criminal Justice	Political Science
Economics	Psychology
Educational Policies, Programs, and Institutions	Public Administration
Educational Psychology	Social Welfare
	Sociology

While contributions to public policy analysis will be encouraged in many areas, the units listed above will be given particular attention in fulfilling this element of University mission.

Taking all three factors into account, 23 schools and departments emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time in order to alleviate the understaffing problem, facilitate the attainment of selective excellence, and strengthen our work in public policy analysis. Those 23 schools and departments are:

Anthropology	Geology
Atmospheric Science	German
Biology	Mathematics
Business	Philosophy
Chemistry	Physics
Computer Science	Political Science
Criminal Justice	Psychology
Economics	Public Administration
Educational Policies, Programs, and Institutions	Reading
Educational Psychology	Rhetoric and Communications
Geography	Social Welfare
	Sociology

Although these schools and departments should be viewed as the major candidates for growth at this time, the University must and will fulfill its obligation to provide the critical mass of resources needed in all academic units. As previously stated, the needs of

academic programs can change dramatically and in a short period of time, and thus any statement of priorities must be periodically updated to reflect new circumstances which justify additions to and subtractions from the above list.

Guided by this general framework of priorities, all schools and departments will be asked in early Fall, 1976 to estimate the resources needed over the next three years to achieve their goals and to accommodate their planned enrollments. Those first estimates will set in motion an iterative process whereby needs, on the one hand, and projected resources on the other are brought into balance. The units will be involved throughout this process in order to ensure that the decisions on future allocations are consistent with the goals and priorities established for the same period. Annual budgetary decisions can then be made within the context of multi-year plans developed by each unit.

The basic format to be used in developing the plans will be distributed in early Fall, 1976. The format will allow each unit to state its own unique goals in relation to the campus mission and to suggest alternative directions as appropriate. These plans, to be updated and evaluated annually, will also provide the basis for any needed changes in the institution's priorities for resource allocation, including changes in the above list as appropriate.

Enrollment Planning

As indicated in Part II of this report, the total enrollment level authorized for the University at Albany is unlikely to change significantly in the near future. This does not mean, however, that the enrollment mix (e.g., by major, level) will remain constant, nor

years; (c) the strategies by which the goals, objectives, and priorities are to be accomplished; and (d) the level of resources needed to provide the requisite quality and quantity of services in support of educational mission.

The development of departmental plans with a strong focus on the support of educational mission will provide much of the information needed for decisions on administrative priorities at the campus level. As discussed below, however, there are several major needs which transcend the responsibilities of specific offices and which deserve immediate attention by the administration.

Priorities for Administrative Action

The following areas deserve primary attention by the administration in the immediate future:

- The need to more effectively facilitate the research activities of faculty through provision of increased funding and other forms of support.
- The need to provide increased financial support for graduate students.
- The need to increase the level of non-State financial support available to academic programs.
- The need to establish more effective liaison relationships with State government officials in keeping with the emphasis on public policy analysis.
- The need to reduce overall administrative costs to the extent practicable, and to redirect the savings to academic programs and to units in direct support of those programs.

Each of these major priority areas is discussed more fully below.

Facilitation of Research

As defined in Part V of this report, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study in the University. Faculty members at a university center assume an obligation to be engaged in creative forms of scholarly inquiry, and the administration, in turn, has an obligation to facilitate such activity in all ways possible. While facilitation is often constrained by requirements emanating from external sources, there are, nonetheless, ways by which both the quality and quantity of support for research can be improved. The following actions are either already underway or planned for the near future:

- A major study will be initiated during 1976-77 to develop new methods of encouraging and facilitating research activities on a campus-wide basis. In general, the focus of the project will be on (a) the elimination of any barriers to research which may exist; (b) the creation of appropriate incentives in a variety of forms; and (c) development of the means by which the research-related goals and objectives stated in Part IV of this report can be most effectively accomplished.
- Through redeployment within the administration, one full-time professional staff member will be added to the Office of Research. Addition of this staff member will enable the office to expand its capability for establishing appropriate relationships with granting agencies; disseminating information on funding opportunities to researchers, and otherwise facilitating the conduct of research activities on a campus-wide basis.
- As discussed more fully below, plans are underway to establish a research center which would play a major role in facilitating and encouraging research on public policy issues throughout the campus.

In addition to these specific actions, the administration will continue to seek out new sources of funding and take other appropriate steps to encourage research activities of faculty.

Increased Support for Graduate Students

Stipends for teaching assistants and graduate assistants at the University at Albany have remained at the same level for six years, and recent reductions in the various forms of State financial aid have only exacerbated the problem. The campus must take the initiative to find new sources of funding for graduate students and to develop appropriate methods for attracting high quality students to our advanced programs.

A campus-wide task force will be created to study the problems of recruitment and financial aid and to develop a recommended plan of action for the University. This task force will be appointed in cooperation with the Graduate Academic Council in September 1976, and its final report should be submitted by early December, 1976. Staff support will be provided to the task force as necessary in order to expedite completion of this critical task. Our continued development as a major university center will depend to a large extent on our ability to attract and support graduate students of high quality, and we must act now to prevent further erosion of our competitive position.

Increased Non-State Support

As discussed in Part II of this document, there is likely to be little increase in the level of operating support provided by the State in the foreseeable future. Consequently, new financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support from non-State sources to further develop selected programs.

With the help of the SUNYA Foundation, the Benevolent Association, and the Alumni Association, a major effort will be made during 1976-77 to develop such strategies. The Vice President for University Affairs has been assigned primary responsibility for this task, and it is expected that a recommended plan of action will be developed by March, 1977.

Interaction With State Government

Contained in the 1977-78 Preliminary Budget Request of this campus is a proposal to establish a University-wide research center which will focus on the analysis of public policy issues. As stated in that request, the five major goals of the center are:

- To organize and maintain continuous liaison with agency heads, legislators, and other public officials to identify major issues and problems facing the State.
- To maintain a current University-wide inventory of faculty strengths and areas of expertise and to communicate the existence of such expertise to appropriate groups and individuals. A computerized "matching" process will be developed to link the needs of government, on the one hand, with faculty expertise on the other.

- To stimulate faculty and student research on major issues and problems, by (a) arranging meetings with appropriate public officials, (b) assisting faculty and students in identifying research questions which are appropriate to a university setting, and (c) obtaining support for research from appropriate sources.
- To initiate and monitor major research projects and to establish the means for bringing a variety of discipline-based skills to bear on problems of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary character.
- To coordinate the development of a staff college, conferences, workshops, and other appropriate vehicles for sharing knowledge with government officials.

If approved, the center will represent a major vehicle for implementing that element of University mission focusing on public policy analysis.

One immediate step to be taken is a series of conferences on campus to identify projects of mutual interest to faculty, on the one hand, and key government officials on the other. These conferences will include a variety of workshops and deliberative sessions which focus on key policy issues and the nature of the University-Government interface in addressing those issues.

A second major action to be taken is the appointment of an advisory group to the President, consisting of faculty and members of both the executive and legislative branches of State government. This group will be convened at appropriate intervals to discuss specific needs of State government and the University's role in meeting such needs.

Reduction of Administrative Costs

All campuses of the State University of New York have limited flexibility in the allocation of resources between academic programs and administrative departments. Externally imposed requirements for accountability, for example, have costs associated with them that cannot be avoided. In addition, the budget structure itself limits the degree to which a savings in administrative costs can be translated into a gain for academic programs. Despite these limitations, however, we must continually seek ways by which administrative costs can be reduced and the savings redirected to academic programs.

The Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources suggested several alternatives for further study, all of which will be addressed during 1976-77. Some studies are already underway, and several promise to achieve significant cost reductions (e.g., secretarial pooling, elimination of unneeded telephone instruments and lines). In addition to these special studies, all administrative units are being urged to reduce costs of present operations to the extent practicable.

Summary

This section of the report has identified the major functions and priorities of the administration for the near future. Five major areas were identified as priorities for administrative action: more effective facilitation of research; development of increased support for graduate students; development of an increased level of non-State financial support; creation of more effective liaison relationships

with State government; and reduction of administrative costs to the extent practicable. Several specific action strategies were indicated in each of these areas, with others to be developed as the planning process evolves.

PART VII

TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

This document has focused on defining the future goals, objectives, and priorities of the University at Albany, with only slight attention given to questions of implementation. It is being widely distributed for reaction and response, both on and off the campus. Based on the responses, the goals, objectives, and priorities will be refined in conjunction with the Educational Policy Council of the University Senate. Work can then begin on broader questions of implementation which emerge and begin to take shape during the consultative process.

During the period of consultation, work can proceed concurrently on four major fronts:

- All academic units can begin to develop their own three-year plans, the general formats for which will be distributed in early Fall 1976. While institutional-level mission statements provide an overall direction and context for our work, the heart of educational planning is within each discipline and field. Although some particulars of the institutional context may be changed through the consultative process, the present document provides enough information to permit early thinking on the future goals, objectives, and priorities of individual units. It is anticipated that the new format will replace those currently used in the preparation of annual reports.
- All administrative units also can begin preparation of three-year plans in Fall 1976. Those plans, to be strongly focused on support of educational mission, will delineate goals, objectives, and priorities in a standard format for review at the campus level. This process will result in determination of additional administrative priorities at the unit level to supplement those outlined in Part VI of this document. The format for departmental plans will be distributed in early Fall.
- During the period of consultation on the present document, work can begin on implementation of those administrative priorities outlined in Part VI. Those actions are critical to the accomplishment of this institution's purposes simply because we are a university, and thus their implementation need not await full resolution of the many issues raised elsewhere in this document.

- Finally, work can also proceed on development of the strategies to be employed for assessing the degree of goal attainment by the University. The results of much of the University's work cannot be measured in a quantitative sense, to be sure, but we must develop more effective means for assessing how well we are doing in relation to goals established. It is important educationally that we evaluate our results, and it is also important to provide legislators and others with evidence of our accomplishments.

The major task now at hand is to identify any needed changes in, and additions to, the present document. Both written and verbal comments are welcomed. Please submit comments directly to the Office of the President.

TOWER TRIBUNE

Vol. 8, No. 2

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

September 7, 1976

A Proposed Statement of Mission

INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth a proposed statement of mission for the State University of New York at Albany. It is tentative in its present form and is being distributed to appropriate groups and individuals both on and off the campus for reaction and response. The document is also incomplete, in that it does not contain specific school or department plans for the future. Those plans will be developed during 1976-77 as a part of a comprehensive planning process and ultimately appended to this document.

As used in this document, the term "mission" refers to the goals, objectives, and priorities of the institution as a whole. These are first-order decisions which define *what* the institution should do rather than *how* it should be done. A complete plan must address both formative and implemental questions, of course, but it is important to separate the two initially. Full discussion of future direction can be more effectively accomplished if unfettered by implementation issues which, while important to the final plan, rest upon the more basic questions from which "mission" is derived.

The evolution of the Albany campus is traced briefly in Part I to establish the historical context in which future-oriented decisions are to be made. In Part II the major forces affecting our future mission are examined. A rather detailed list of goals and objectives is presented in Parts III and IV, with emphasis on the end results which we should seek to achieve as a major institution of higher learning. Part V focuses on the academic program offerings and priorities for the next three years and establishes the basic framework for program planning within schools and departments. A brief discussion of administrative functions and priorities is presented in Part VI, with emphasis on the major actions to be taken to facilitate the work of faculty. Finally, Part VII is devoted to a discussion of the major steps which must be accomplished in order to move toward implementation of university mission and the development of a comprehensive action plan for the future.

PART I: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The University at Albany has a rich and eventful past, a past that has always been characterized by a strong focus upon quality education. Whatever its form the institution has consistently been identified as one of the best. As a result, its reputation as an institution of higher education is strong and its list of notable graduates lengthy. The future mission of this institution reflects this persistent commitment to quality education and academic reputation, both in its programs and in its graduates.

Historical Development: 1844-1962

Founded in 1844 as the State Normal School (later changed to New York State Normal College), the institution's primary purpose for its first 60 years of existence was the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1905, the mission changed dramatically: all courses of study designed to prepare elementary school teachers were discontinued;

admissions requirements were made essentially the same as those of other eastern colleges of good standing; and, most importantly, all students were required to pursue subjects deemed essential to a liberal education. Also in 1905, the institution was authorized to award the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Through these changes the College was committed to preparing a liberally educated person who was also competent to teach in the secondary schools.

The succeeding decades saw that commitment fulfilled. Under the leadership of William J. Milne, Abram R. Brubacher and John M. Sayles, a faculty noted for its devotion to liberal education was recruited; and the distinction between a "teachers' college" and a "college for teachers" was transformed from a semantic subtlety into an instructional reality. Though the size of the College changed little during this period, its intellectual development proceeded robustly, as evidenced by a lateral growth into the full range of arts and sciences and a vertical growth into masters programs geared to the continuing professional needs of its constituency in secondary education.

In 1948, along with its sister public institutions, the College became a part of the newly established State University of New York (SUNY). Its primary mission remained unchanged, however, and it was not until September, 1961, that the College enrolled its first class of undergraduate students in liberal arts programs which did not include any required study in teacher education. In 1962, the institution was designated as one of four university centers to be developed in the SUNY system and thus began the rapid transition from a single-purpose college to its present role as a center for graduate and undergraduate education.

The Growth Era: 1962-1971

In the decade following its designation as a university center, the Albany campus experienced rapid growth in program offerings, enrollments, and resources. The number of academic departments tripled, enrollments and faculty quadrupled, library holdings increased tenfold, and a new physical plant was constructed and occupied. The growth was more than numeric and physical, of course, and the sense of quality expected of a major university permeated decisions made on program development, faculty recruitment, and student admissions. Visible evidence of the continued emphasis placed on quality during the growth era can be seen in the test scores of entering students, the scholarly achievements of faculty, the existence of numerous honor societies, and the high demand for admission at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The initiation of a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in a later period (March, 1974) finds its roots in the insisted emphasis on quality throughout the new University's first decade.

The rather sudden change in role, and hence in expectations of the campus, necessitated expansion on a broad front. The range of programs appropriate to a major university had to be developed rapidly and in a constricted time frame. Aspirations were defined at a high level and, with few exceptions, were realized. The quantitative and qualitative elements of growth were

mutually reinforcing, and the University was in many ways a product of the munificence of the times and the esteem in which higher education was held. By the end of this decade of growth, the University was offering 49 baccalaureate programs, 52 masters programs, and 28 at the doctoral level — a remarkable achievement given the high quality which was also attained in many programs.

Thus the dominant feature of the era was growth, not unplanned or undirected expansion, but growth on the broad front of program activity necessitated by the times. Little attention had to be given to the question of institutional mission under such expansionist conditions, as the problem of choice had primarily an additive dimension, i.e., decisions on which programs to add and/or expand were made only at the expense of not adding and/or expanding some other programs. When steady-state conditions emerged rather abruptly in the early 1970's, few institutions were prepared to adjust to the prospect of equilibrium or of decline in program activity — and the University at Albany was no exception.

The Recent Past: 1971-Present

Only with fulfillment of the grim predictions of steady-state financing have institutions begun to seriously address the question of mission and priorities. The University at Albany began earlier than most, adopting redeployment strategies in the early 1970's to cope with shifts in workload patterns which resulted from the elimination of all distribution requirements for baccalaureate degrees. The redeployments were ad hoc in nature, however, and were based on a narrow assessment of the circumstances peculiar to one or more programs at the time, rather than being guided by a more comprehensive plan for institutional development.

The work of the Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities in 1975 represented a significant break with the past pattern of sequential redeployment. That group made recommendations with regard to position redeployments and program cuts within a single iterative process, i.e., all programs were examined together, and no single recommendation was made final prior to an examination of the whole. The work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources in early 1976 continued the pattern of making resource allocation decisions in simultaneous, rather than sequential, fashion.

While neither the Select Committee nor the Presidential Task Force was charged with delineating long-range developmental priorities for the campus, the work of both focused attention on the need for such a plan. The Educational Policy Council also recognized the need for a "coherent institutional plan" in its review of the Task Force's report. It has become apparent to all that the times have changed, and that our future development must be guided by more than a broad and generally unstated sense of university purpose. We, and others like us, are in a critical period. If institutions of higher education are to effectively use the increasingly scarce resources available to them, decisions about those resources must reflect *prior* decisions on goals, objectives, and developmental

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

priorities. Thus we must not only be more selective in our choices as to what is important, but also ensure that those choices are subsequently reflected in budgetary decisions.

The following pages offer a proposed statement of mission to guide our future activities as a major university center. The intent is to develop an institutional direction which at once provides a commonality of purpose and preserves the rich diversity of the intellectual enterprise. The future is uncertain but challenging — we must prepare well and move boldly.

PART II: MAJOR FORCES AFFECTING FUTURE MISSION

The future mission and priorities of the University at Albany must be shaped in response to four interrelated forces:

- Its designation as a university center within the SUNY system, and hence its role as an institution devoted to the highest order of learning.
- The needs and opportunities inherent in the immediate environment — the Capital District and the northeastern region of New York State.
- The internal strengths and resources of the institution — human, financial, and physical.
- The premise that all programs and activities undertaken must meet standards of quality appropriate to a university of national and international reputation.

Each of the above forces has significant implications for the future development of the campus and will be discussed separately below.

The Concept of a University Center

There are four university centers within the SUNY system: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook. These campuses, while themselves different in many ways, share several common features which distinguish them from the four-year colleges, the community colleges, and other units within SUNY:

- The offering of a broad range of programs encompassing the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional schools.
- Development and maintenance of doctoral, masters, and other advanced degree programs which strengthen and reinforce undergraduate offerings in the disciplines and professional fields.
- A balanced emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of the two activities and excellence in each.
- A significant proportion of graduate and advanced professional students.
- An enrollment mix which maintains an appropriate balance among in-state, out-of-state, and foreign students.
- Program offerings and content geared in part to a national market at necessarily national levels of quality.
- An intellectual climate for students dominated by the focus on advanced education of high quality.

These common features of the four university centers establish a context for their work which is distinctly national and international in character. They are institutions devoted to the highest order of learning and, as such, are obligated to the advancement of knowledge on behalf of the society at large and to the attainment of excellence in both teaching and research as measured by rigorous standards of scholarship.

These features, in turn, require a strong emphasis on graduate education; faculty and students of high intellectual competence; performance expectations appropriate to a first-class university; and a shared commitment on the part of faculty, staff, and students to those values which underlie the learning process and the search for knowledge.

What are the principal values to which we must be committed as a major university? First is a commitment to education of the whole person. A university is obligated to equip students with a variety of intellectual paradigms and strategies and to stimulate a genuine excitement for learning — in short, to provide a liberal education which has as its aim the complete development of self. This basic premise holds true regardless of the specific area of study chosen by a given student, for specialized study without exposure to the ideas, principles, and theories central to all learning can only result in intellectual parochialism and short-sightedness. Thus the interconnectedness of knowledge, as well as the increasingly complex nature of our society, demands that students be educated broadly and well. The goals and objectives for student development presented in Part III of this document reflect our commitment to education of the whole person.

The second value builds on the first, in that the interconnectedness of knowledge and the liberal learning principle together create the need for a critical mass of disciplines and fields of study at a university. Without a broad range of undergraduate and graduate offerings in the humanities, fine arts, sciences, and selected professional fields, an institution cannot lay claim to being a university. This assertion arises partially from the need to offer that range of programs essential to a liberal education, but it arises more forcefully from the fact that no discipline or field of study is an intellectual island. In many instances the mutually reinforcing nature of disciplines and fields is readily apparent, especially within the broad intellectual families which form natural groupings within a university. Interactions across these broad families exist but are not so readily apparent. For example, the social sciences provide much of the theoretical underpinnings for advanced study in a variety of professional fields. In turn, the construction and testing of theories in the professional schools reinforces and adds to the store of knowledge in the underlying disciplines. Interactions of similar character can be traced across other groupings, as problems of an interdisciplinary nature emerge and demand the application of diverse research strategies and skills.

Just as important to the concept of a university are those interactions which do not emerge directly from knowledge interdependencies, but arise rather from the shared commitment of scholars to the advancement of knowledge in all its forms. The pursuit of knowledge does not proceed *in vacuo*, no matter how specialized the subject. All forms of scholarly inquiry are inextricably bound together, as paradigms, concepts, and general principles are shared in a setting of lively intellectual discourse and criticism. It is this process of debate and discussion, unconstrained by the boundaries of particular disciplines, which reinforces and strengthens the work of all scholars.

The third value at the heart of a university has been noted in various ways above. It is a commitment to the discovery and advancement of knowledge, with or without regard to practical application. This value clearly reflects the unique role of the university within society, for no other institution is so clearly charged with the pursuit of knowledge. Knowledge is an end in itself, and thus this basic value reflects the spirit of mankind in general, the insatiable urge to explore the unknown and to understand the

meaning of events and relationships. Because of this commitment, many of the world's greatest discoveries have occurred in institutions of higher learning.

This commitment to basic research and scholarly inquiry is especially critical to graduate education, of course, but it is also fundamental to the development of quality instructional programs at the undergraduate level. Teaching and research are inseparable in the university setting. Consider the following:

- An essential element of teaching is the introduction of the most recent findings of research into curricula design. Communication of the frontiers of research knowledge is thus an obligation in teaching, whether in individual discussion with students, in small informal seminars, or in the formal classroom.

- Research in a university is necessarily a teaching activity. The research scholar who isolates himself completely from students in uninterrupted study belongs properly in a research organization of government or industry, but not in a university. Research in a university should contribute to the education and training of students. In this sense, research should be regarded as teaching, not separate from it.

- A faculty member engaged in significant scholarly and artistic activity is more likely to communicate an enthusiasm for the process of intellectual discovery than one not so engaged. The importance of the imaginative and creative elements of intellectual inquiry is thereby transmitted more effectively to students.

- The involvement of both graduate and undergraduate students in the process of inquiry itself (either through direct participation or through discussion of research results in the classroom) enhances critical thinking and analytical skills.

- The faculty member engaged in scholarly inquiry is more aware of the various subtleties of research design and methodology than the faculty member not so directly engaged. Students are thus denied these critical insights if research is not conceived as an obligation of faculty members.

- The faculty member engaged in scholarly inquiry is generally more capable of interpreting and discussing the results of other researchers with students, because of greater familiarity with techniques and design nuances which may drastically affect the meaningfulness of research results.

This last point is especially critical for quality teaching when one considers that textbooks are becoming more and more research-based and research-oriented. No longer can a faculty member adequately assess the quality of textbook material without in-depth familiarity with the latest research results and the quality of those results.

A final value inherent in a university is its commitment to freedom of thought and inquiry and to the rights and obligations of faculty to engage in free and open discussion of concepts, theories, and principles. This basic value is essential to the advancement of knowledge, and there can be no restriction on the scholar's right to pursue knowledge of his or her choosing. To deny this right is to imply that the results of scholarly inquiry are entirely predictable and, therefore, that the benefits to society can be estimated in advance. Thus without complete freedom to pursue inquiry and publish the results, the range of scholarship in a university may be unduly restricted by inexpert opinion about what constitutes "useful" knowledge.

Freedom of thought and inquiry is just as essential to teaching as it is to research. The timeless statement on academic freedom prepared by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915 argues the point convincingly:

It is scarcely open to question that freedom of utterance is as important to the teacher as it is to the investigator. No man can be a successful teacher unless he enjoys the respect of his students, and their confidence in his intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the student that the teacher is not expressing himself fully or frankly, or that college and university teachers in general are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage which youth always demands in those whom it is to esteem. The average student is a discerning observer, who soon takes the measure of his instructor. It is not only the character of the instruction but also the character of the instructor that counts; and if the student has reason to believe that the instructor is not true to himself, the virtue of the instruction as an educative force is incalculably diminished. There must be in the mind of the teacher no mental reservation. He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is.¹

In the same statement, the AAUP recognizes explicitly that the rights of faculty carry with them certain "correlative obligations":

The claim to freedom of teaching is made in the interest of the integrity and of the progress of scientific inquiry; it is, therefore, only those who carry on their work in the temper of the scientific inquirer who may justly assert this claim. The liberty of the scholar within the university to set forth his conclusions, be they what they may, is conditioned by their being conclusions gained by a scholar's method and held in a scholar's spirit; that is to say, they must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry, and they should be set forth with dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language. The university teacher, in giving instruction upon controversial matters, while he is under no obligation to hide his own opinion under a mountain of equivocal verbiage, should, if he is fit for his position, be a person of a fair and judicial mind; he should, in dealing with such subjects, set forth justly, without suppression or innuendo, the divergent opinions of other investigators; he should cause his students to become familiar with the best published expressions of the great historic types of doctrine upon the questions at issue; and he should, above all, remember that his business is not to provide his students

with ready-made conclusions, but to train them to think for themselves, and to provide them access to those materials which they need if they are to think intelligently.²

By virtue of asserting these basic rights and obligations of academic freedom, the faculty of a university must also accept the responsibility to "purge its ranks of the incompetent and unworthy, or to prevent the freedom which it claims in the name of science from being used as a shelter for inefficiency, for superficiality, or for uncritical and intemperate partisanship . . ." The University at Albany is committed to preserving the rights of free inquiry and discussion, while also maintaining the high standards of scholarship which are attendant to such rights.

The discussion thus far has centered on those values which any great university must profess in order to fulfill its unique role within a national and international context. At the same time, the four university centers within SUNY also serve many local and regional needs:

- Although many out-of-state and foreign students are also enrolled, their full- and part-time student population is drawn heavily, and broadly, from New York State.

- They offer a variety of life-long learning opportunities for the population within their geographic regions.

- They apply the expertise of their faculty and staff to problems and/or issues arising locally, but which also are of concern statewide, nationally and internationally.

- They offer a variety of cultural, clinical, and other activities or services which directly benefit area residents but which also contribute to the intellectual development of students.

One frequently hears universities described as local, regional, or national, yet the criteria for such distinctions are rarely made explicit. Despite this ambiguity, the view persists that an institution must choose whether it is to be a "great university" or merely a local one. This view must be rejected for three reasons. First, the very essence of a major university is its commitment to the discovery and transmittal of knowledge, regardless of whether the immediate benefit to society is measurable or immeasurable, tangible or intangible, long-run or short-run. The advancement of knowledge is a primary goal of all disciplines and fields of study and herein lies the greatest contribution to both the local community and the nation. When viewed in this way, the national and local dimensions of a university's work are mutually reinforcing and inseparable.

Second, it is rare that the important issues and problems existing in one geographic region are of only nominal concern to another. Thus the expertise of a university can be brought to bear on problems which, although arising locally, are of universal concern. The application to knowledge to such problems can yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty, as well as to the local community.

Finally, the greatness of a university is not judged by scholars in terms of the types of problems or concepts being addressed, but rather by the *quality* of the address itself — the soundness of the methodologies employed and the degree to which conclusions are supported by the evidence. If the twin conditions of universality and researchability are present, problems arising locally present unique opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge and for dissemination of the research results

to students, scholars and practitioners. The issue of a "national" versus "local" focus then becomes moot, as the obligations intrinsic to both are fulfilled. A university center within SUNY can, and must, meet both sets of expectations if it is to provide leadership as a public institution of higher learning in New York State.

Needs and Opportunities in the Capital Region

Location in the Capital District of New York presents unique needs and opportunities to the University at Albany and many of its programs. The existing and potential strengths of the University, in turn, constitute a major resource for governmental, industrial, cultural, and other organizations. How to best join our strengths and resources to the needs and opportunities inherent in the environment is a pivotal issue in defining the campus mission.

The University addresses many external needs and problems already, of course, and in a variety of ways. Applied research on problems of concern to government and other agencies; life-long learning opportunities for area residents; technical consulting assistance to various organizations; student internships in the community; evening classes to improve educational access; the provision of qualified graduates — these and other forms of service to the community are important and will continue. However, they are forms of service legitimately expected of any major public university, regardless of its location. Therefore, the distinctiveness of the University at Albany's mission is not to be found in those services generally performed by all universities, but rather in selected programs and activities which can be directed toward the needs and opportunities unique to our location.

We obviously cannot meet all the needs or capitalize on all the opportunities available to us. In order to define an institutional thrust for the future, then, choices must be made among the various types of issues and problems which legitimately could be given high priority. Where should we place our emphasis — our priorities — in order to fulfill this distinctive element of university mission? The answer lies partially in our role as a university center, partially in our unique location, and partially in the internal strengths which we possess now and have the potential to enlarge. In short, the emphasis should lie in addressing the issues and problems of major concern to State government and to us all.

The State of New York is currently faced with a variety of policy issues related to economic development, education, environmental management, social services, crime and the administration of justice, energy use, and other areas. In addressing such problems, agency heads, legislators and other government officials are charged with (a) developing appropriate goals for enhancement of the public good, (b) defining and implementing the appropriate means (programs and procedures) for achieving those goals and (c) monitoring the results and taking corrective action where necessary. Regardless of the specific *area* of concern (e.g., social services, education), fulfillment of these general responsibilities requires a strong base of research and training in a variety of forms. It is within this context that the University's functions of discovery, transmittal, and application can fruitfully intersect the process of policy formation — not necessarily through direct involvement in decision-making or implementation, but through generation of the knowledge needed to undergrid that process. Our existing faculty expertise and interests provide a strong base for further development of an institutional emphasis

1. General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure presented to and adopted by the Annual Meeting of the Association, December 31, 1915. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. 1, Part 1 (December 1915), p. 28.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

on public policy analysis. In addition, we have the potential to enlarge that base of expertise and thus to provide the support required for this element of University mission.

There are at least two additional reasons for the emphasis on public policy analysis. First, adoption of this unique thrust can be accomplished in a way which reinforces that element of mission which we share with all other universities — developing the intellectual capacities of students and discovering, applying, and transmitting knowledge. There are educational benefits to be gained for both students and faculty, as well as opportunities for the advancement of knowledge on a variety of fronts. Second, a concentrated focus on major policy issues can contribute importantly to the local area, while in no way compromising the national and international character of this university. As indicated earlier, scholars judge a university in terms of the quality of its research and teaching activities and in terms of the significance of the problems being studied, neither of which need be compromised by this unique thrust. The economic, social, and technological problems facing this State are not unique. Other regions of the nation and world have, or will have, many of the same concerns.

Much of our work in policy analysis will be conducted on an individual basis, as faculty members initiate and pursue specialized projects of their own choosing. It is, clearly, the role of the faculty to define the content and methodology of specific research efforts, regardless of the discipline or field. From a University-wide perspective, however, it is desirable to establish broad criteria as to what areas are most appropriate for attention. In general, the policy issues and problems should meet the following criteria in order to be appropriate for address in the university setting:

- The issues and problems should be amenable to the application of rigorous research methodologies and techniques.
- They should not be so narrowly defined as to preclude the derivation of generalizable conclusions.
- The benefits to be realized from address of the problems and issues should be of sufficient importance to society to warrant our commitment.
- Address of the issues and problems should yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty.
- The University should possess the expertise necessary for successful address of the issues and problems, or have the potential for attracting such expertise.

In no way does this emphasis on the public sector mean a lessening of concern for those disciplines and fields which, by their nature, have little intellectual kinship with such issues and problems. We must preserve and nurture those disciplines which are essential for education of the whole person and be satisfied with nothing less than excellence there also. We are first and foremost a university center, and we must therefore provide all units with the resources needed to achieve that level of quality befitting a national university. The emphasis on matters of public policy is an *additive* concern, an enlargement of mission to embrace the unique needs and opportunities inherent in our immediate environment.

If the above conditions are met, the national and local dimensions of the University's work should indeed be mutually reinforcing.

Internal Strengths and Resources

The human, financial, and physical resources of the institution present both opportunities and constraints for our future mission. On the

constraints side, we must assume the following:

- There will be only slight growth in the total enrollment on this campus. The SUNY Master Plan currently allows for growth to 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85, or seven percent above the current level.
 - There will be little or no increase in the number of faculty and staff positions funded by the State in the foreseeable future.
 - The physical capacity of the University at Albany will remain virtually unchanged, although there will be some flexibility to change the character of existing space.
 - Increases in the operating budget of the institution will likely be limited to inflationary adjustments over the next few years.
- Thus the institution must prepare itself for a future which is "steady-state" insofar as the quantitative elements of growth are concerned. If managed properly, however, there are significant resource-related opportunities available to us:

- A limitation on total enrollments means that our attention can be centered on the qualitative aspects of growth, unfettered by erratic workload patterns and the usual crises associated therewith. Enrollment patterns within the University must be monitored closely to insure the attainment of educational goals.
- Although the total number of faculty funded by the State may remain constant, there will continue to be flexibility for the reallocation of positions.
- There are many first class programs and faculty now present on this campus. Selective development on a more compact operating front can expand those strengths still further. Although we must build from existing strengths, other programs critical to future mission will be improved where feasible.

Our present physical capacity is sufficient, by and large, for the projected enrollments on this campus. With careful management of the space available, appropriate reallocations can be accomplished. Moreover, the *quality* of the physical plant is, by most yardsticks, excellent.

While we may see no increases in the total operating budget aside from inflationary adjustments, there is flexibility for reallocation in this area also. By no means is our operating budget so small as to prevent the selective development of excellence on this campus.

The opportunities and constraints delineated above have several additional implications for future mission. First, future resource allocation decisions must be guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future. We can no longer expand on an even-handed basis, nor can all programs be developed to equivalent levels of quality. Second, we must increase our efforts at obtaining funds from non-State sources. New financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support for students and for faculty research, and to support the further development of selected programs. Third, the budgeting process of the future must be strongly influenced by a reallocative approach, the major objective being to provide those resources necessary for attainment of the goals established. Finally, we must intensify our efforts to identify alternative ways by which costs can be reduced without corresponding reductions in effectiveness.

Quality

The final major force affecting future mission is our continuing obligation to offer only those programs which meet high standards of quality. We cannot, of course, expect all programs to attain equivalent levels of quality, but we can and must expect all programs to achieve

a level of quality befitting a national university. As discussed more fully in Part V, all programs must be provided those resources needed to achieve and/or maintain an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments. In addition, resources must be provided as necessary to those programs which are capable of attaining positions of national leadership in selected disciplines and fields.

The meaning of the concept "quality" is often blurred by disagreements over appropriate measures of the phenomenon. We seek to attain quality on two major dimensions: in education of students and in the advancement of knowledge. On the first dimension, many would argue that our success in educating students should be evaluated in terms of the post-institutional experiences of graduates, career or otherwise. While those experiences are indeed important, there are many causal factors which affect "success in life," only one of which is an educational experience at a university. (See Part III for further elaboration of this point.) Thus even if one could devise agreed-upon measures of the "success" phenomenon, determination of the degree of variance which could be attributed to the educational experience would be impossible. Consequently, universities also attempt to measure the quality of the instructional process itself to determine if students are being educated well. There are obvious difficulties here in devising valid and reliable instruments for assessment, and we must continue to search for the methods most appropriate to different types and levels of instruction.

On the second dimension, the advancement of knowledge, a university must rely heavily on perceptions and evaluations by scholars who are deemed capable of judging the work of its faculty. Thus peer review is the most important means for assessing the quality of research and other forms of scholarly inquiry. In order to conclude that a given program has achieved "a level of quality befitting a national university," that program should be evaluated favorably by a group of individuals who themselves are viewed as leaders within the national community of scholars. Consequently, the program review procedures at the University at Albany must be guided by this overarching criterion in order to effect our commitment to attaining the highest standards of quality.

Finally, there are many activities of faculty, staff, and students which directly impact agencies, organizations, and individuals external to the University. We must increase our efforts to obtain quality assessments from these external sources when appropriate. Given the mutually reinforcing nature of the national and local dimensions of our work, an evaluation of quality in selected programs and activities would be incomplete without such inputs.

Summary and Conclusions

The major forces discussed in Part II provide the underpinnings for defining the mission of the State University of New York at Albany. The major planning premises which emerge are summarized below:

- The concept of a university center establishes a context for our work which is distinctly national and international in character. Consequently, at the heart of this University are the values of liberal learning; advancement of knowledge; freedom of thought and inquiry; high quality; and a rich diversity of disciplines, fields, and modes of scholarly inquiry.
- The concept of a university center establishes obligations not only to the larger society and to the broad community of scholars everywhere, but obligations to the local community as well. The University at Albany must

meet both sets of expectations and in a mutually reinforcing way.

An unique emphasis at the University at Albany will be the application of knowledge to policy issues of public concern, with no lessening of concern for the other functions and programs essential to a first class university. The issues selected for address must meet certain criteria in order to ensure that both the community and the University are served well. Special attention will be given to addressing the problems of greatest concern to State government.

In making priority choices, the University must build on existing strengths. All programs to be continued must meet those standards of quality appropriate to a national and international university.

Given a context of limited resources, the University must develop in a selective fashion, guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future and by continuing efforts to achieve greater cost/effectiveness in our work.

The next two sections of this document set forth goals and objectives to guide the future of the University at Albany. Part III focuses on goals and objectives for student development, emphasizing those end results of the learning process which we seek to accomplish. Part IV delineates goals and objectives focused more squarely on societal development and thus on the end results sought from the discovery, application, and transmittal of knowledge.

PART III: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

A statement of goals and objectives for student development should identify the desired outcomes, or results, of the learning process. In adopting this outcomes orientation, one must distinguish between the ultimate consequences of achieving the goals and the goals themselves. Achievement of whatever goals are set should contribute to the ability of students to (1) function effectively as educated persons in society; (2) assume the responsibilities of both leadership and citizenship within society; (3) engage in a life-long learning process of self-development; and (4) engage in meaningful and productive careers. However, these consequences are a function of many variables which are either beyond the scope of a university's work or beyond its control. Thus a university cannot, indeed should not, assume full responsibility for the life success or failure (however defined) of its graduates. The university must, however, assume the responsibility for *facilitating* individual development through accomplishment of the goals which are adopted as its rightful obligations.

There are three types of developmental needs which we seek to meet: intellectual, personal/social, and career. Of these three, we must give the greatest attention to intellectual development, the task for which we are best qualified. Intellectual development encompasses the acquisition of both content and skills, particularly those skills of critical thinking, analysis, and creativity. The nature of a university demands that the areas of knowledge offered be of sufficient rigor and complexity to require application of these higher-order skills. Thus students can be both "educated" and "trained," as they are being prepared for careers which demand critical thinking and reasoning skills and the ability to apply knowledge gained through general and specialized study. However,

successful integration of goals set for intellectual development, on the one hand, and career development on the other cannot be accomplished in programs which are characterized by a kind of intellectual routine and which demand little of students beyond a relatively straightforward acquisition of knowledge. Such programs, while necessary to meet some specific vocational needs of society, do not fall within the role and scope of a major university center.

The personal and social development of students is, without question, inseparable from the process of intellectual development. What must be provided are opportunities for the student to develop a sense of competence, identity, and commitment — in short, a learning environment which will enhance the positive sense of self. Certainly no one would advocate a dehumanizing or completely value-free approach to intellectual development. Nor can one deny that the full embracement of life is contingent on the complete development of self. Yet despite these fundamental truths, any university must concentrate its efforts on that task for which it is best fitted — the expansion and growth of intellectual capabilities. In terms of time, attention, and actual resource deployment, intellectual development is our dominant concern. Thus the goals for personal and social development presented below reflect a threshold, the ends which must be achieved to fulfill our larger obligations to students and to facilitate their growth as complete and responsible individuals.

The goals and objectives stated below not only reflect our obligations as a university center, but also constitute guidelines for the design of programs and curricula. They are applicable to both undergraduate and graduate programs, although implementation strategies will vary considerably across levels and types of instruction. They also provide a starting point for address of important questions related to organization for learning.

GOAL I. TO DEVELOP SKILLS OF LEARNING AND CRITICAL THINKING

- A. To develop in students skills of information acquisition, reasoning and lucid communication.
- B. To develop in students the ability to integrate knowledge from a variety of perspectives.
- C. To develop in students the ability to apply alternative modes of reasoning and methods of problem solution and the ability to distinguish the logically relevant from the irrelevant.
- D. To develop in students the ability to derive and formulate general principles for clarification and explanation.

GOAL II. TO DEVELOP AND FOSTER THE PROCESS OF INTELLECTUAL DISCOVERY AND THE EXPLORATION OF THE UNKNOWN

- A. To develop in students a familiarity with the philosophies, methods and processes of research in the professional and disciplinary fields.
- B. To encourage in students intellectual curiosity, resourcefulness and enthusiasm for learning.
- C. To encourage an awareness in students of the importance of the imaginative and creative elements of intellectual endeavor.

D. To develop in students an attitude of individuality that promotes intellectual introspection, initiative and self-assertion.

GOAL III. TO DEVELOP AN AWARENESS OF AND INTEREST IN THE BREADTH OF HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT AND CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

- A. To develop in students an understanding and historical perspective of the cultural, political, legal, scientific, and social components of societies.
- B. To develop in students an understanding of the processes and consequences of change in societies and the interrelationship of economic, technological, political, legal and social forces in change.
- C. To develop in students an understanding of the diversity of forms in which intellectual and artistic achievements have been expressed.
- D. To encourage students to develop a life-long interest in intellectual and artistic endeavors.

GOAL IV. TO DEVELOP AN UNDERSTANDING OF PERSONAL VALUE SYSTEMS AND OF VALUE FORMATION

- A. To encourage in students the formation and enhancement of a positive self-concept.
- B. To develop in students an understanding of the processes and dimensions of value formation, clarification and conflict.
- C. To develop in students an understanding of the effects of values on thought and behavior.
- D. To encourage in students attitudes of personal responsibility for the consequences of applying their knowledge and skills.
- E. To provide a wide range of learning opportunities designed to enhance interpersonal communication of ideas and feelings.

GOAL V. TO DEVELOP THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS NECESSARY TO QUALIFY STUDENTS FOR ENTRY-LEVEL WORK IN APPROPRIATE FIELDS

- A. To prepare students to meet entry-level expectations in those fields of study which traditionally lead to clearly defined jobs and careers.
- B. To encourage those students in majors which traditionally have not led to clearly defined employment to develop skills which would qualify them for career entry.
- C. To provide students the opportunity to gain work experience in appropriate field(s) of study prior to graduation.

GOAL VI. TO DEVELOP THE ABILITY AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR SELECTING CAREER EMPLOYMENT

- A. To develop students' career decision-making skills.
- B. To develop an orientation toward serial careers.

- C. To develop effectiveness in seeking employment.
- D. To provide information to employment communities concerning abilities of university graduates to meet their needs.

GOAL VII. TO MAINTAIN A CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT WHICH WILL FOSTER A SENSE OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

- A. To demonstrate through institutional policies and practices the University's commitment to the ideals and values of social responsibility.
- B. To provide an atmosphere which will encourage students to explore and discuss contemporary social issues.
- C. To provide opportunities for students to participate in and be exposed to a wide variety of cultural events.
- D. To provide opportunities for students to participate in University decision-making processes.
- E. To provide opportunities for students to participate in community activities and governmental processes.

GOAL VIII. TO ENSURE THE SAFETY OF STUDENTS AND PROVIDE THOSE SERVICES AND FACILITIES WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL TO THEIR PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

- A. To ensure the safety of students in on-campus laboratory, classroom and extracurricular activities and in facilities used for living, eating and leisure.
- B. To provide those facilities and personnel needed to diagnose and restore to normal physical well-being students whose problems are temporary and/or minor and, in serious cases, to make responsible references.
- C. To create and maintain a healthy, clean, and psychologically and physically supportive campus environment for the entire University community.
- D. To provide adequate facilities to allow the University community various forms of physical exercise and recreation.
- E. To maintain and improve the quality of housing facilities and services.

Consistent with the obligations to students expressed earlier, the wording of the goals and objectives conveys our primary concern for intellectual development, while also setting forth the needed emphasis on career and personal/social development. While the strategies for achievement of the goals may vary across fields of study and even across specific courses, the desired outcomes apply to all graduates of the University at Albany. As discussed later in this document, all academic and administrative units will be asked to articulate goals and objectives which, while reflective of the unique discipline or field, are also compatible with the institutional goals outlined above.

PART IV: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT

The three basic functions of any major university are the discovery, transmittal, and ap-

plication of knowledge on behalf of students and society. The functions are interrelated, of course, and they are accomplished through the activities of teaching, research, and consultation — all resulting in service to society. In this sense, "public service" is an outcome, or end result, of all our work and not some separately identifiable set of activities as commonly presumed. An adequate conceptualization of the service phenomenon is long overdue in universities everywhere and necessary for full understanding of our goals and objectives for societal development. The following paragraphs discuss briefly the primary outcomes associated with the three major functions.

As discussed in Part II, the potential benefits to society resulting from the *discovery of knowledge* are frequently unknown or unpredictable in any immediate sense, and even more difficult to measure. On the other hand, much knowledge discovered as a result of basic research in universities has had immediate visibility and utility to society. In general, discovery efforts have the primary outcome of advancement of knowledge, the visibility of which varies by discipline and field, but the importance of which has been demonstrated innumerable times. Thus the University at Albany is committed to the discovery of knowledge for knowledge's sake, that foundation on which universities have been built as unique institutions within society.

With regard to the *application of knowledge*, the outcomes or benefits to society generally emerge from a problem-oriented focus, primarily through the activities of research and consultation. Thus, whereas the discovery function tends to be concept-oriented, the application function focuses initially on specific concerns of society. The distinction is often vague at best, and little is to be gained by attempting to classify too finely various types of research as "basic" or "applied." Nonetheless, the conceptual distinction is useful, particularly when addressing the larger issue of a university's role within society. In general, the result of the application function can be thought of as problem analysis, putting to work the varied resources of the university on important concerns of society or components thereof.

The first goal stated below reflects the University's commitment to research and scholarly inquiry for its own sake, as well as the commitment to utilize the results of such efforts, where appropriate, to assist in the solution of specific societal problems. Thus basic and applied research efforts contribute in equal importance to "societal development," and both demand a strong theoretical and methodological base within a university.

The *transmittal of knowledge* also has clearly identifiable outcomes to society. In some forms, the transmittal of knowledge is indistinguishable from its application, as students carry forth the results of classroom and laboratory work for use in later life. The university also has an obligation to transmit the results of its discovery efforts to students, the scholarly community, and the general public through books, journal articles, exhibitions, and other forms. As conceived here, however, transmittal in a university setting occurs primarily through the teaching activity, whether that activity be for degree or non-degree students. In this sense, the primary outcome or result of transmittal is educated human beings. The goals for student development presented in Part III also apply here, but the University is also obligated to offer opportunities for life-long learning which are uniquely directed to the local community. The second goal presented below reflects this obligation.

Cultural and clinical services are often provided to the general public as part of the normal instructional process. For example, student internship programs of various types not only enhance learning, but also provide direct assistance to individuals and organizations in the local area. Similarly, productions or exhibits in the fine arts contribute importantly to student development and at the same time provide a valuable cultural resource for area residents. Thus, the third and final goal listed below reflects the importance of such services in the life of a university.

In summary, the interrelated functions of discovery, application, and transmittal generate four major outcomes for society: *advancement of knowledge* (Goal I below); *problem analysis* (Goal II below); *educated people* (Goal III below), plus all the goals for student development presented in Part III of this document; and *cultural and clinical services* (Goal III below). "Public service" as used here is the overarching construct which embraces the four types of outcomes, because all our work is done on behalf of society. The analysis of public policy issues, for example, is only one form of problem analysis which, in turn, is only one of the four principal components of public service rendered by any major university.

GOAL I. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE GENERAL ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND TO THE SOLUTION OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

- A. To encourage individual faculty to undertake research and scholarly inquiry of any nature which promises to contribute to the advancement of knowledge.
- B. To educate students, through their participation in research activities, in modes of critical thought and in methods of scholarly inquiry.
- C. To significantly increase the level of financial support available for research.
- D. To support the communication of research findings to peers, students, and interested persons outside the academic community.
- E. To encourage and facilitate research on policy issues of special concern to State government.
- F. To ensure that address of various concepts, problems and issues results in benefits not only to society, but also to the educational mission of the University.
- G. To develop more effective coordinating structures for bringing discipline-based skills to bear on problems of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary character.
- H. To maintain and/or attract the faculty expertise necessary for successful address of selected issues and problems.

GOAL II. TO OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

- A. To offer degree and non-degree programs consistent with the needs of the learning society and within the capabilities and mission of the University at Albany.
- B. To provide, through course scheduling, audit capabilities, and other means, the opportunity for qualified area residents to enroll in courses offered as a part of on-going degree programs.
- C. To encourage departments to offer life-

- long learning opportunities consistent with the missions of those units.
- D. To clarify and strengthen the organizational relationships of the various academic and administrative units involved in the provision of life-long learning opportunities.
- E. To implement a process that ensures quality in all life-long learning programs.
- F. To develop, where appropriate, off-campus instructional programs to meet the needs of area residents.
- G. To cooperate with other providers of life-long learning opportunities in the Capital District to ensure complementary thrusts and offerings.

GOAL III. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL AREA THROUGH THE PROVISION OF CULTURAL AND CLINICAL SERVICES WHICH REINFORCE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

- A. To provide a variety of cultural events for faculty, staff, students, and area residents.
- B. To integrate a variety of work-action experiences into curricula as appropriate and to thereby provide benefits to the local area and to students and faculty.
- C. To be involved in improving the quality of the social and physical environment.
- D. To provide technical consulting assistance in the resolution of local problems.
- E. To make available the facilities of the University for use by appropriate community groups.
- F. To provide other appropriate services to the community which are consistent with, and reinforce, educational mission.

While the goals and objectives listed above provide a commonality of purpose for all units of the University, each contributes to their accomplishment in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of emphasis. Thus it is not intended that each unit pursue all of the objectives outlined, or even all of the goals. As an institution, however, we must be committed to the pursuit of them all and develop more effective means for assessing our degree of goal attainment.

PART V: ACADEMIC PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND PRIORITIES

No statement of institutional mission is complete without a delineation of program offerings and priorities. The goals and objectives presented in Parts III and IV of this document are not alone sufficient to establish future direction, as there are many disciplines and fields which could contribute significantly to the attainment of those desired end results.

All universities are constrained in their range of program offerings for both educational and economic reasons. The reduction of twenty degree programs on the Albany campus this past year reflected a shared realization that an inventory of 129 programs could not be supported at the requisite level of quality in the years ahead. The range of programs sustained is befitting of a university, however, and the work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources left the institution wholesomely formed for the future.

The Task Force members did not have the benefit of a written statement of mission to guide their deliberations. Nonetheless, there was ready comprehension of the general future of this University, especially its role as a major university center, the nature of any university's obligations to students and to society, and the increasing attention to be given to policy issues of public concern. The criteria used for program evaluation constitute evidence of this understanding, as does the final report itself. Consequently, what is needed now is not a re-evaluation of the Task Force's recommendations, but rather a coalescing of their work and the information on which it was based into a statement of future program offerings and priorities. The time horizon selected is three years, or through 1979-80, with the understanding that the plan should be updated at least annually to reflect the latest information available on accomplishments, program needs and resource availability.

Program Offerings

The President's Report on Priorities and Resources, dated March 15, 1976, set forth the programs to be sustained on the Albany campus. As indicated below, the inventory includes 42 programs at the bachelor's level, 48 at the master's level, 21 at the doctoral level, and eight University certificate programs. In addition, the University will continue its commitment to the Educational Opportunities Program, to which we admit students who have the potential to engage in university-level work but who have some deficiency in academic preparation and who are economically disadvantaged.

Bachelor's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (17) — Art, Chinese, Classics (Greek, Latin, and Greek & Roman Civilization), English, French, German, Italian Studies (assuming Division of Budget release of funds appropriated by the Legislature), Judaic Studies, Linguistics, Music, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communications, Russian, Spanish, Theatre.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (11) — African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Asian Studies, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Puerto Rican Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (9) — Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science & Applied Math, Earth Science, Geology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Physics.

School of Education: (1)
School of Business: (2) — Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Public Affairs: (1) — Political Science.

School of Social Welfare: (1)

Course Sequences

Course sequences will continue in Art History, Italian Studies, Journalism, Peace Studies, Polish, Urban Studies, and Women's Studies. Several departments will also continue to offer courses in environmental analysis.

Master's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (13) — Classics (Classical Archeology, Greek, and Latin), English, French, German, Italian Studies (as-

suming Division of Budget release of funds appropriated by the Legislature), Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communications, Russian, Spanish, Studio Art, Theatre.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (8) — African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Social Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (7) — Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (12) — Counseling, Curriculum Planning, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Psychology, General Professional, Reading, Rehabilitation Counseling, Special Education, Student Personnel Services, Teacher Education, TESL — Bilingual Education.

School of Business: (2) — Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Library and Information Science: (1)

School of Social Welfare: (1)
School of Criminal Justice: (1)
School of Public Affairs: (3) — Political Science, Public Administration, Public Affairs.

Doctoral Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (4) — English (Ph.D. and D.A.), German, Philosophy, Spanish.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (5) — Anthropology, Economics, History, Psychology, Sociology, (temporarily suspended).

Division of Science and Mathematics: (6) — Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (2) — Ph.D., Ed.D.
School of Criminal Justice: (1)
School of Public Affairs: (2) — Political Science, Public Administration.

School of Social Welfare: (1) — temporarily suspended

University Certificate Programs

School of Education: (7) — Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Research, Reading, Student Personnel Services.

School of Education and Social & Behavioral Sciences: (1) — School Psychology.

The program array represents a rich diversity of disciplines and fields, encompassing the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional schools. Accompanying the diversity is a high degree of intellectual interdependence, of course, and a shared commitment to those values and principles of scholarly inquiry which are at the very heart of a university and know no discipline bounds. From a campus-wide perspective, there are four major expectations of all programs being sustained:

- Achievement of a level of quality befitting a university center, as measured by rigorous national standards of scholarship. As established in Part II of this document, all programs must aspire to the attainment of excellence in both instruction and research if the purposes of a university center are to be attained.
- Development and pursuit of goals and objectives which reflect the unique character of the discipline or field, but which are also com-

patible with the overall goals and objectives of the University. The institution-wide goals and objectives presented in Parts III and IV of this document provide both a commonality of purpose and a framework within which each unit can discern and articulate its own unique goals.

Thus, there will be variation among units insofar as both the manner and degree of contribution to any one of the institution-wide goals and objectives, and rightfully so. It is expected, however, that the uniqueness of each unit can be articulated within the broad framework established in Parts III and IV.

• **Achievement of a balanced emphasis on teaching and research.** As discussed in Part II, all programs at a university center must seek a balanced emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of these two components of scholarship, and excellence in each. As used here, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study. Thus, there is no single model for research, nor is there any single indicator which can be used in assessing the quality of scholarly contributions in the various disciplines and professional fields. However, one common characteristic of such activities is communication of their results to both peers and students. Thus all faculty members have an obligation to be engaged in research and scholarly activity, to communicate the results, and thereby to contribute to the intellectual development of students and colleagues and to the advancement of knowledge.

• **Implementation of faculty evaluation, reward, and development plans which are appropriate to a university center.** The primary responsibility for faculty evaluation rests with schools and departments. Thus each unit must specify clearly those elements of scholarship to receive primary attention in faculty evaluation; the information needed to conduct the evaluation; the process by which the information will be collected; and ways by which the information also can be utilized for development of faculty.

These expectations constitute the primary focal points for coordination and oversight of programs from a campus-wide perspective. The forms of scholarship to be taken as evidence of achievement will differ across academic units, but there should be no variations in the level of accomplishment expected. Continued development as a university center demands the maintenance of high performance standards for both students and faculty in all programs offered on the Albany campus.

Priorities for Resource Allocation

Estimates of resources available to academic programs over the next three years must be tempered by the uncertainty of future allocations by the State, and by the knowledge that the needs of specific programs can shift rapidly in a short period of time. The existence of such uncertainty does not make less important the need for institutional planning, however, as individual academic units must be given more adequate lead time for recruitment and internal planning in general. Uncertainty as to future events means only that we must build a degree of flexibility into planned allocations and recognize that any three-year plan may be subject to change in one or more of its parts. Thus the intent for future allocations can be clearly established, while recognizing that deviations from the plan may be necessary as external events unfold and as unanticipated needs emerge in specific programs.

There are three major factors to be con-

sidered when establishing the institution's priorities for resource allocation:

• The obligation of the institution to provide all programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.

• The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.

• The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three major factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. The question which must be given a satisfactory answer can be stated thusly: What is the critical mass of scholars and support resources needed in a given unit to (a) provide the needed breadth and depth of intellectual expertise, (b) accommodate planned enrollments, and (c) accomplish the range of intellectual activities expected of all faculty at a major university center? Some quantitative workload indices can be employed to help answer this question, but all such factors must be weighed in relation to the unique features of a given discipline or field. Judgment is involved here, certainly, but these interrelated conditions must be satisfied in all programs to be offered on the Albany campus.

As a result of shifts in student interests over the years, changes in program purposes and scope, and other factors, a number of units currently fall below the critical mass of resources required. The following departments and schools should be given a net increase in faculty lines and associated support funds as soon as is feasible:

Business
Computer Science
Economics
Psychology
Public Administration
Rhetoric and Communications
Social Welfare
Sociology

The composition of this list will vary over time, of course, as circumstances change and as units not now listed experience the need for increased resources.

The second factor to be considered in delineating priorities takes cognizance of (a) the University's commitment to achieve peaks of excellence among its programs and (b) the obligation of the institution to facilitate and sustain extraordinary achievements on the part of its faculty. There are several academic units which have attained, or are close to attaining, national stature. Still others have strong potential to become recognized as among the leaders in the discipline or professional field. Based on external evaluations and other forms of evidence, the following units either have attained positions of national leadership already or have the potential to do so in a reasonable period of time:

Anthropology
Atmospheric Science
Biology
Chemistry
Criminal Justice
Educational Psychology
Geology
German
Mathematics
Philosophy
Physics
Public Administration
Reading

Resource augmentation is not necessarily called for in order to facilitate the achievement and/or maintenance of very high quality in the units listed. However, the University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate. The list is not immutable, of course, and should change as developmental efforts continue in other departments.

The third factor reflects the increased emphasis to be placed by the University on the address of public policy matters. As indicated in Part II of this report, such address can take a variety of forms and occur in numerous disciplines and fields. However, the following schools and departments have demonstrated special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York:

Atmospheric Science
Business
Computer Science
Criminal Justice
Economics
Educational Policies, Programs
and Institutions
Educational Psychology
Geography
Geology
Political Science
Psychology
Public Administration
Social Welfare
Sociology

While contributions to public policy analysis will be encouraged in many areas, the units listed above will be given particular encouragement in fulfilling this element of University mission.

Taking all three factors into account, 23 schools and departments emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time in order to (a) provide all units with an appropriate critical mass of resources; (b) facilitate the attainment of national leadership; and (c) strengthen our work in public policy analysis. Although these schools and departments should be viewed as the major candidates for growth at this time, the University must and will fulfill its obligation to provide the critical mass of resources needed in all academic units. As previously stated, the needs of academic programs can change dramatically and in a short period of time, and thus any statement of priorities must be periodically updated.

Guided by this general framework of priorities, all schools and departments will be asked in early Fall, 1976 to estimate the resources needed over the next three years to achieve their goals and to accommodate their planned enrollments. Those first estimates will set in motion an iterative process whereby needs, on the one hand, and projected resources on the other are brought into balance. The units will be involved throughout this process in order to ensure that the decisions on future allocations are consistent with the goals and priorities established for the same period. Annual budgetary decisions can then be made within the context of multi-year plans developed by each unit.

The basic format to be used in developing the plans will be distributed in early Fall, 1976. The format will allow each unit to state its own unique goals in relation to the campus mission and to suggest alternative directions as appropriate. These plans, to be updated and evaluated annually, will also provide the basis for any needed changes in the institution's priorities for resource allocation.

Enrollment Planning

As indicated in Part II of this report, the total enrollment level authorized for the University at Albany is unlikely to change significantly in the near future. This does not mean, however, that the enrollment mix (e.g., by major, level) will remain constant, nor does it mean that the future mix must be left to chance. If educational considerations are to be given equal weight with demographic phenomena, we must initiate a more balanced approach to enrollment planning — one which reflects not only student interests but also the program plans and priorities of the institution and the societal needs being served.

Departments have already been asked to project, on a tentative basis, the enrollments which are *educationally desirable* over the next three years. The projections will be modified, of course, as departments prepare their plans during Fall, 1976 and as further discussions occur. Thus the campus-level guidelines at this stage of mission articulation must be limited to the following:

• The total enrollments on the Albany campus will not exceed the current Master Plan projections, i.e., 13,500 FTE students by 1980-81 and 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85. The total FTE enrollment in 1975-76 was approximately 13,175.

• On a headcount basis, the campus will seek to maintain the current mix of approximately two-thirds undergraduate students and one-third graduate.

• Recruitment efforts will be increased to ensure attraction of high quality students and to facilitate the enrollment of students with the potential for advanced work.

• New approaches will be developed to attract additional financial support for graduate students.

As indicated in Part VI, a campus-wide task force will be created in Fall, 1976 and charged with development of new strategies for recruitment and for increased financial support of graduate students.

Summary

This part of the document has identified the academic program offerings and priorities of the University at Albany for the near future. 111 degree programs are to be sustained, including 42 at the bachelor's level, 48 at the master's level, 21 at the doctoral level, and eight University certificate programs. Based on three major factors, 23 schools and departments were identified as the major candidates for growth and hence the priority claimants for additional resources in the near future.

Given this statement of future direction, each academic unit will be asked to develop a brief planning document during Fall, 1976, with emphasis on future goals, priorities, enrollments, and resource needs. These documents will provide the basic inputs needed for decisions on future allocations.

PART VI: ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND PRIORITIES

The administrative staff of the University exists for one primary reason: to facilitate and support the work of faculty and students. In order to accomplish this basic purpose, the five major functions of administration are:

• Initiate development of the institutional plans, policies and procedures necessary to preserve and enhance the vitality of the intellectual enterprise as a whole.

• Acquisition of the resources necessary to support teaching, research, and learning, both directly through its own efforts and indirectly through provision of information on funding sources and other matters to faculty and students.

• Provision of those services to faculty and students which either directly support the learning process or are necessary to its existence.

• Maintenance of appropriate relationships with various external publics to facilitate the work of faculty and students and to satisfy accountability requirements in both educational and economic terms.

• Development and maintenance of appropriate coordination and oversight activities to ensure that the goals and priorities of the institution are accomplished as effectively and efficiently as possible.

These five major functions provide the framework within which all administrative units must articulate their goals and objectives to support the educational mission of the institution. Each administrative department will be asked in Fall 1976 to prepare a three-year plan, with emphasis on the following: (a) the goals and objectives of the department, including the way in which accomplishment of those goals contributes to the educational mission of the University; (b) the priorities of the department for the next three years; (c) the strategies by which the goals, objectives, and priorities are to be accomplished; and (d) the level of resources needed to provide the requisite quality and quantity of services in support of educational mission.

The development of departmental plans with a strong focus on the support of educational mission will provide much of the information needed for decisions on administrative priorities at the campus level. As discussed below, however, there are several major needs which transcend the responsibilities of specific offices and which deserve immediate attention by the administration.

Priorities for Administrative Action

The following areas deserve primary attention by the administration in the immediate future:

• The need to more effectively facilitate the research activities of faculty through provision of increased funding and other forms of support.

• The need to provide increased financial support for graduate students.

• The need to increase the level of non-State financial support available to academic programs.

• The need to establish more effective liaison relationships with State government officials in keeping with the emphasis on public policy analysis.

• The need to reduce overall administrative costs to the extent practicable, and to redirect the savings to academic programs and to units in direct support of those programs.

Each of these major priority areas is discussed more fully below.

Facilitation of Research

As defined in Part V of this report, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study in the University. Faculty members at a university center assume an obligation to be engaged in creative forms of scholarly inquiry, and the administration, in turn, has an obligation to facilitate such activity in all ways possible. While facilitation is often constrained by requirements emanating from external sources, there are, nonetheless, ways by which both the

quality and quantity of support for research can be improved. The following actions are either already underway or planned for the near future.

• A study will be initiated during 1976-77 to develop new methods of encouraging and facilitating research activities on a campus-wide basis. In general, the focus of the project will be on (a) the elimination of any barriers to research which may exist; (b) the creation of appropriate incentives in a variety of forms; and (c) development of the means by which the research-related goals and objectives stated in Part IV of this report can be most effectively accomplished.

• Through redeployment within the administration, one full-time professional staff member will be added to the Office of Research. Addition of this staff member will enable the office to expand its capability for establishing appropriate relationships with granting agencies; disseminating information on funding opportunities to researchers, and otherwise facilitating the conduct of research activities on a campus-wide basis.

• As discussed more fully below, plans are underway to establish a research center which would play a major role in facilitating and encouraging research on public policy issues throughout the campus.

In addition to these specific actions, the administration will continue to seek out new sources of funding and take other appropriate steps to encourage research activities of faculty.

Increased Support for Graduate Students

State-appropriated stipends for teaching assistants and graduate assistants at the University at Albany have remained at the same level for six years, and recent reductions in the various forms of State financial aid have only exacerbated the problem. The campus must continue to take the initiative in finding new sources of funding for graduate students and in developing appropriate methods for attracting high quality students to our advanced programs.

A campus-wide task force will be created to study the problems of recruitment and financial aid and to develop a recommended plan of action for the University. This task force will be appointed in cooperation with the Graduate Academic Council in September 1976, and its final report should be submitted by early December, 1976. Staff support will be provided to the task force as necessary in order to expedite completion of this critical task. Our continued development as a major university center will depend to a large extent on our ability to attract and support graduate students of high quality, and we must act now to prevent further erosion of our competitive position.

Increased Non-State Support

As discussed in Part II of this document, there is likely to be little increase in the level of operating support provided by the State in the foreseeable future. Consequently, new financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support from non-State sources to further develop selected programs.

With the help of the SUNYA Foundation, the Benevolent Association, and the Alumni Association, a major effort will be made during 1976-77 to develop such strategies. The Vice President for University Affairs has been assigned primary responsibility for this task, and it is expected that a recommended plan of action will be developed by March, 1977.

Interaction with State Government

Contained in the 1977-78 Final Budget Request of this campus is a proposal to establish

a University-wide research center which will focus on the analysis of public policy issues. As stated in that request, the five major goals of the center are:

- To organize and maintain continuous liaison with agency heads, legislators, and other public officials to identify major issues and problems facing the State.

- To maintain a current University-wide inventory of faculty strengths and areas of expertise and to communicate the existence of such expertise to appropriate groups and individuals. A computerized "matching" process will be developed to link the needs of government, on the one hand, with faculty expertise on the other.

- To stimulate faculty and student research on major issues and problems, by (a) arranging meetings with appropriate public officials, (b) assisting faculty and students in identifying research questions which are appropriate to a university setting, and (c) obtaining support for research from appropriate sources.

- To initiate and monitor major research projects and to establish the means for bringing a variety of discipline-based skills to bear on problems of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary character.

- To coordinate the development of conferences, workshops, and other appropriate vehicles for sharing knowledge with government officials.

If approved, the center will represent a major vehicle for implementing that element of University mission focusing on public policy analysis.

One immediate step to be taken is a series of conferences on campus to identify projects of mutual interest to faculty, on the one hand, and key government officials on the other. These conferences will include a variety of workshops and deliberative sessions which focus on key policy issues and the nature of the University-Government interface in addressing those issues.

A second major action to be taken is the appointment of an advisory group to the President, consisting of faculty and members of both the executive and legislative branches of State government. This group will be convened at appropriate intervals to discuss specific needs of State government and the University's role in meeting such needs.

Reduction of Administrative Costs

All campuses of the State University of New York have limited flexibility in the allocation of resources between academic programs and administrative departments. Externally imposed

requirements for accountability, for example, have costs associated with them that cannot be avoided. In addition, the budget structure itself limits the degree to which a savings in administrative costs can be translated into a gain for academic programs. Despite these limitations, however, we must continually seek ways by which administrative costs can be reduced and the savings redirected to academic programs or to units in direct support thereof.

The Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources suggested several alternatives for further study, all of which will be addressed during 1976-77. Some studies are already underway, and several promise to achieve significant cost reductions (e.g., secretarial pooling, elimination of unneeded telephone instruments and lines). In addition to these special studies, all administrative units are being urged to reduce costs of present operations to the extent practicable.

Summary

This section of the report has identified the major functions and priorities of the administration for the near future. Five major areas were identified as priorities for administrative action: more effective facilitation of research; development of increased support for graduate students; development of an increased level of non-State financial support; creation of more effective liaison relationships with State government; and reduction of administrative costs to the extent practicable. Several specific action strategies were indicated in each of these areas, with others to be developed as the planning process evolves.

PART VII: TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

This document has focused on defining the future goals, objectives, and priorities of the University at Albany, with only slight attention given to questions of implementation. It is being widely distributed for reaction and response, both on and off the campus. Based on the responses, the goals, objectives, and priorities will be refined in conjunction with the Educational Policy Council of the University Senate. Work can then begin on broader questions of implementation which emerge and begin to take shape during the consultative process.

During the period of consultation, work can proceed concurrently on four major fronts:

- All academic units can begin to develop their own three-year plans, the general formats for which will be distributed in early Fall 1976. While institutional-level mission statements provide an overall direction and context for our work, the heart of educational planning is within each discipline and field. Although some particulars of the institutional context may be changed through the consultative process, the present document provides enough information to permit early thinking on the future goals, objectives, and priorities of individual units. It is anticipated that the new format will replace those currently used in the preparation of annual reports.

- All administrative units also can begin preparation of three-year plans in Fall 1976. Those plans, to be strongly focused on support of educational mission, will delineate goals, objectives, and priorities in a standard format for review at the campus level. This process will result in determination of additional administrative priorities at the unit level to supplement those outlined in Part VI of this document. The format for departmental plans will be distributed in early Fall.

- During the period of consultation on the present document, work can begin on implementation of those administrative priorities outlined in Part VI. Those actions are critical to the accomplishment of this institution's purposes simply because we are a university, and thus their implementation need not await full resolution of the many issues raised elsewhere in this document.

- Finally, work can also proceed on development of the strategies to be employed for assessing the degree of goal attainment by the University. The results of much of the University's work cannot be measured in a quantitative sense, to be sure, but we must develop more effective means for assessing how well we are doing in relation to goals established. It is important educationally that we evaluate our results, and it is also important to provide legislators and others with evidence of our accomplishments.

The major task now at hand is to identify any needed changes in, and additions to, the present document. Written and verbal comments are encouraged from schools, departments, and individuals. They should be submitted to the Office of the President by October 15, 1976.

September 22, 1976

Dear Colleague,

The Committee of Concerned Faculty is conducting a survey to collect faculty opinion on Mr. Fields' mission statement so that we may make a formal response to it in the near future. This survey is being conducted because, as far as we know, no one else is conducting one.

We should appreciate your substantive opinions concerning the following questions:

a) How can the objectives of the mission statement be implemented by your department's school?

b) What procedures would you suggest be followed to fulfill administration plans to reorganize SUNYA departments into graduate and undergraduate faculties?

c) Do you expect that your department will be able to redirect its own resources to public policy pursuits?

d) What impact do you expect the "public policy image" will have on your department's national reputation in your discipline?

e) What effect do you expect the dissolution of the College of Arts and Sciences will have on undergraduate liberal arts education?

f) Do you think each college should grant the B.A. degree?

g) Do you have any other general or specific observations about the mission statement?

The Committee will guarantee the anonymity of your comments.

Committee of Concerned Faculty

Please bring or return your

comments to Paul Meadows
Room 325 SS

Arts and Sciences Faculty

I. Responses

Question A.

I. Natural Sciences and Math.

- 11) Objectives indicated for College of Science and Math. can be implemented without difficulty; 7) we are already implementing that part of the M. S. listed under 'the concept of a University Center', eg., under services to community--consultancies, seminars, etc. 5) if our college continues to strive to maintain quality we will certainly be meeting one of the primary objectives of the M. S.; 1) two members of this department submitted a committee report (based on two years work) directed toward an alternative program leading to a A. B. Report turned down for reasons still unknown. This proposal is seen as 'an excellent way' of serving the commty.; 1) no answer; 4) I am totally opposed. This would not only be divisive but is also quite unnecessary from a practical standpoint.

II. Humanities

- 16) our department performs a vital function in the area of liberal education. It is in no position to contribute to the analysis of public policy; 13) I hope that any implementation will involve extensive interaction with departments and individual faculty members at all levels, democratic decision-making, and progressive modification of ends and means as we go along. But I feel that operations up to this point have not been structured in this way; 10) as far as I can tell the M. S. intends the destruction of the humanities. So I see little contribution we can make to its achievement; 8) by encouraging frequent offering of selected courses, and adding a few additional; 2) by helping students to read, to write and to speak more effectively, and to become more human and humane, in order that after graduation they may have richer personal lives and contribute to the well-being of society. Any direct, concrete implementation during their college years is impossible in the curriculum of our dept.

III. Social Sciences

- 6) I think there is no way in which the objectives of the M. S. can be implemented other than the ways and the degree to which the objectives are presently being implemented in an implicit manner. All that can be done is to make explicit what is implicit. Even firing or retrenching people and hiring new, mission-oriented individuals won't make a difference for at least a decade; 12) I assure that the objectives of the M. S. will be implemented in the Soc. and Beh. Sciences largely by action of individual departments and even individual members within departments. Obviously, the President's allocation of resources to departments (in close consultation with the Academic V. P. and the Dean) will also reflect the M.S.

QUESTION B

I. Natural Sciences and Math

11) No plan to reorganized SUNYA departments has been announced by the Administration. Please refer to factual information or indicate where you have seen such plan; 7) It is not clear to me that this statement is even true; at any rate, it is not feasible to carry out and will not be attempted; 5) the choices should be made within each school, and for the most part, within each department, based on a reasonable set of externally defined criteria such as rank and publications; 4) I am totally opposed to the creation of graduate and undergraduate faculties. This would not only be divisive but is also quite unnecessary from a practical standpoint; 1) no answer.

II. Humanities

16) The creation of grad. and undergrad. faculties would strengthen graduate instruction. Care must be taken, however, that members of graduate faculties retain some undergraduate teaching interests and duties; 13) most of the members of my department are opposed to separating its faculty into 'grad.' and 'undergrad.' groups. Traditionally, this division is less firm in my field, and the majority of us prefer to teach courses at both levels; 10) such a reorg. can only be fatal to both. If anything is certain in this world... it is that grad. programs, especially those in the humanities, are going to be drastically reduced in the years ahead. The decline in enrollments is already drastic, and it is equally certain that the State cannot (and should not) be forced to support programs that are at the least costly and unnecessary. If the grad. faculty wishes to climb out on that already-rotten limb, let them... If Albany has any future it is going to have to be essentially an undergraduate institution. The M. S. goes precisely in the wrong direction, as did the Select Committee and the Task Force. The Admin. seems to have a very potent death wish indeed; 8) a vicious distinction if formalized precisely! (Of course on the average some teach chiefly at one level or the other.) The link is vital; 2) I am not at all in favor of this kind of division for any department; for smaller departments, such as ours, it's impossible.

III. Social Sciences

6) I consider the idea an abomination within the context of this institution. Undergrad. education will save grad. education only if the faculty is an integrated faculty; 12) I would oppose plans to reorganized SUNYA departments into grad. and undergrad. faculties. That would involve making unnecessary invidious distinctions of status; functional distinctions can be made without such formality.

QUESTION C

I. Natural Sciences and Math

11) the 'public policy' image has not bearing on my department's national reputation in my discipline; 7) I don't think anyone expects us to; 5) Only to a very limited extent by a few statisticians. I suspect that at most the statisticians would act as consulting resourced for faculty in GSPA or elsewhere on studies indicated by colleagues in more 'relevant' departments; 4) see answer to A above; 1) no answer.

II. Humanities

16) No; 13) To some extent -- we could devote more attention to such areas as 'the philosophy of law', 'social and political philosophy', and so on. Within limits, this would not be a bad thing; but it should not disrupt our core work, especially on the graduate level, in theory of knowledge and similar problems; 10) I should hope not. We have important work to do in any University, and should not be detracted by so foolish a windmill; 8) No; 2) No.

III. Social Sciences

6) Not as a department. Individuals have and will continue to serve 'public policy' pursuits but I do not see how this might change; 12) The 'public policy front' seems irrelevant to the mission of my department. There may be some exceptions to this. Some individual members of the department might be helpful in the organization of ad hoc task forces directed at specific 'public front' issues, for example, poverty or family disorganization.

QUESTION D

I. Natural Sciences and Math

Quest
E. { 11) I expect that the reorganization of the C of A and S into three separate Colleges will have a beneficial effect on the administration and planning, whereas it will not effect undergraduate education; 7) absolutely no effect, good or bad; 5) None; 4) Perhaps a slight enhancement for social reasons; 1) no answer.

II. Humanities

15) a very negative impact; 13) If the 'public policy image' went so far as to make our work ancillary to specific programs in these areas, we would suffer in terms of professional image in the discipline, as would any other theoretically oriented effort that confined itself to 'bound' research and limited its freedom of inquiry; 10) probably make us a laughing stock; 8) unfortunate; 2) an unfortunate impact indeed. It's a pity because we really were begining to have a rather respectable 'national reputation' in the discipline (colleges wer sending us graduate students, e tc.)

-4-

Question D (contid.)

III. Social Sciences

6) none--in no way--neither good nor bad. Besides -- why worry about national reputation when all you need is a department to serve as a presidential task force and your department is designated nationally prominent. It's a 'bullshit concept' nationally prominent' and an arbitrary 'put on' device useful to administrators and sycophants; 12) the 'public policy image' will have no effect on this department's national reputation in the discipline. Nor do I think anyone expected it to have any effect.

QUESTION E

II. Natural Sciences and Math

11) I feel that comments should not be made anonymously; 7) The dissolution took place years ago when the faculty voted favorably on the proposal to do away with requirements. This has very little relevance to President Fields, who is just taking the next logical step mandated by the Faculty; 5) it is potentially damaging, but I'm willing to see how things work out. Certainly the CAS currently is too big and too disorganized to be useful for anything; 4) Very little if any. Without course requirements students pursue their own interests -- they are the best judges of what they should be studying; 1) no answer.

II. Humanities

16) a weakening effect; 13) I fear that the dissolution of the C. of A. and S. may accelerate the tendency toward narrowness of technical training in undergraduate educ.; 10) Hard to tell. Possibly none, but then again it might. I seriously doubt that the Pres. has any legal right whatever to order rush a reorganization. Even more disturbing is the faculty acceptance of the action. We have to come to accept tyranny as entirely routine here; 8) will render it confused and anarchic; 2) I'm not sure here, although I did favor helping a College of Arts and Sciences.

III. Social Sciences

6) We have not had a C. of A. and S. for several years now and I cannot see any further deterioration resulting from formal dissolution. The faculty of the university are obligated to set curriculum and they haven't been doing this in any substantive way for many years; 12) the dissolution of the C. of A. and S. will not help move the University in the direction I think it should be moved on the issue of undergrad. liberal education. But at least in the last several years the then-existent CAS did little or nothing to save keep things moving. The future of undergrad. liberal arts education will depend in part on the kinds of institutional arrangements we manage to devise in the coming year.

QUESTION F

I. Natural Sciences and Math

11) no answer; 7) I think it is about time that we got some direction from the Admin., even if it is mostly 'hot air'. After our previous lack of leadership, this is a welcome relief. Where the hell were all these people hiding when a handful of us tried for two or three years to get a viable Faculty Forum going? I find it ironical that some faculty now get concerned when the administration lets us know something, after the faculty barely protested the do-nothing, see-nothing, hear nothing years of Benezet and Sirotkin; 5) If you mean, should each college have final say in what constitutes an acceptable program for its students for a B. A., my answer is no. Fields has urged creation of a structure above the three colleges to define the BA, and I support that idea. Without it, the likelihood that the B. A. will include an adequate measure of liberal arts is small; 4) No--this is a ridiculous suggestion; 1) I recall that two members of this department served on a committee two years ago; their report was directed toward an alternative program leading to the B. A. degree; the report is about a year old... and was run down by this University, for reasons unknown to those who worked on it... It seems that this is really an excellent way to 'serve the community!..!'"

II. Humanities

16) no; 13) no --each college should not grant the BA degree because there should be a breadth of tradition behind such a degree that crosses over the increasingly narrow boundaries of the reduced 'colleges' now envisioned; 19) no opinion; 8) dubious propriety. New degrees needed? Vocational certificates?; 2) I guess we will have to do so, won't we?

III. Social Sciences

6) I think the faculty of a unit should set the requirements for the degree and should grant it when requirements are fulfilled; 12) Should each college grant the B. A. degree? I doubt that it is a meaningful question. I have no objection to the faculty of the Soc. and Beh. Sciences gathering annually to make the formal recommendations for undergrads. who have majored in its departments. But I would not want the S. and B. S. to have total control over the baccal. requirements for its own students.

QUESTION G

I. Natural Sciences and Msth

11) no answer; 7) no answer; 5) I think the 'public policy' slant is a statement of hope, and will become a developing actuality only over a period of years and in a few areas, particularly certain professional schools. For the rest of us, particularly in the A. and Sc., it is a challenge to make ourselves indispensable by maintaining our own scholarship and research on the highest level of quality; 4) not yet; 1) no answer.

II. Humanities

16) It attempts a major shift of the university's development in the wrong direction. It does not respect the traditional role of the faculty in developing curricula and establishing academic priorities; 13) I'm not opposed to every part of the M. S., but the whole history behind it -- the program cancellations and changes in the allocations of resources already put through, the breakup of the C. of A. and S. -- all came about through executive fiat with only a thin veneer of simulated faculty participation. Even now, this response to the President's mission statement is being made almost entirely on faculty initiative with no assurance that it will be well-received or taken seriously. Substantively, there are problems here that call for serious attention of all of us; but procedurally, we seem to be asked merely to accept and rationalize as best we can a set of administratively initiated and developed decisions and programs; 10) it is verbally illiterate. Hard to imagine that whoever wrote it had ever taken fresh human composition. It is written by bureaucrats for bureaucrats and seems to have no real language or meaning at all. Historically it is equally illiterate. The definitions it gives of a university fit none that I know of in history. Its logic is disgraceful even more than comic. It is fully worthy of our administration -- one that acts first and then goes looking for a rationale for the action. It is arrogant and it is ignorant. It takes us ⁱⁿ precisely ~~in~~ the wrong directions. At the moment when the general public is in virtual revolt against the bureaucracy the M. S. swims out to board the most unseaworthy vessel; 8) premature, at best; destructive, if mandated without revision. No real overview offered at present; 2) The emphasis that has been attached to it throws everything out of balance, of course. If the departments directly concerned (GSPA and Business, for example) were encouraged to help wherever they could and when help seemed needed and welcome, that would be good public relations, I suppose, and not too harmful to our reputation as a true university, but the way it has been set up, the emphasis is highly unfortunate.

QUESTION G

III. Social Sciences

6) I consider it to the equivalent of an exercise insign-painting. Any one who is minimally aware of the complexity of a university institution and also the implications of policy involvement by individuals such as faculty would never venture to propose a public policy mission; 12) What is the practical meaning of Part III: Goals and Objectives of Student Development? It seems to me that the faculty must be the group to say whether or not these goals are desirable, and it certainly up to the faculty to devise effective strategies for implementing such goals. There is plenty of material in this section for heated (and hopefully helpful) debate; if yet few faculty spokespersons have such much about this.

II. Responses from Professional Schools

Question A.

14) In much the same way we are now operating; 3) we are placing emphasis upon three selected areas: development of regional models and data bases to expedite regional industrial development; continue to support research in municipal finances; focus on the transfer of decision-system technology from the industrial sector to the health service sector.

Question B

14) abandon the idea; 3) no answer

Question C

14) readily; 3) yes

Question D

14) should help; 3) it is our best opportunity to improve our national reputation. In effect, the public policy orientation turns the major economic problems of N. Y. State into a major research opportunity.

Question E

14) unable to answer; 3) Last year as I served on the SUNYA undergraduate curriculum committee it appeared that the dissolution had already occurred. I would favor a structure with five components: (1) Science and Math; 2) Social Science; 3) Humanities and Language; 4) Prof. Schools; 5) Education

Question F

14) Unable to answer; 3) yes

Question G

14) Sounds very sensible to concentrate offerings rather than scatter our shot (independent of Pub. Ad. nest being feathered; 3) The university must maintain a commitment to the classical dimensions of a liberal education and theoretical research. We should explore innovative educ. programs such as the "Three-Two". Theoretical research in interdisciplinary areas should be encouraged through a restructuring of the tenure system.

III. Anonymous Responses

9) The Mission is a lot of bullshit.

Question A.

17) no answer; 15) by making our service available to the highest bidder.

Question B

17) no answer; 15) drop the idea since the only consequence would be invidious distinctions.

Question C.

17) No; these pursuits are meaningless, without further definition; 15) yes, unfortunately.

Question D

17) detrimental; 15) lower it.

Question E

17) no answer; 15) not certain

Question E

17)no answer; 15) no opinion

Question G

17) it has been implemented through last year's decisions. I think the statement is window-dressing--public policy is this year's quick thought by people who have never done any 15)yes; entitle the statement and perhaps the university motto to "University for HiCo!"



UNIVERSITY SENATE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

DATE: October 11, 1976

TIME: 3 P. M.

LOCATION: Lecture Center 18

A G E N D A

1. Approval of Minutes of September 13 Meeting
2. Council & Committee Reports
3. Open Hearing on Mission Statement

Now that the Senate Councils are nearing completion of their work on the Mission Statement, the Executive Committee wishes to give all of its members and all interested members of the University community an opportunity to offer their views and suggestions concerning the document. Therefore, the October 11 meeting will be an open hearing on the Mission Statement. *Members of the University community are invited to attend and to join in the discussion.*

Those who wish to read prepared statements at the meeting should contact the Senate Office (AD 112 - 457-6481). We will arrange to have such statements presented before the floor is open to discussion. Please limit yourself to five minutes.

The Executive Committee will not recommend action on the Mission Statement at this meeting. Our purpose is to encourage full discussion of the Statement before it is completed, rather than to debate any formal motion with regard to it. We will recommend action on the Mission Statement when it is in its final form.

P L E A S E P O S T

FILE COPY

MISSION STATEMENT

State University of New York at Albany

January 1977

PREFACE

Universities are again in a time of major adjustment, from the period of unprecedented expansion which extended through the 1960's into the era of constraint and consolidation which faces them now. It is a painful time which tests whether universities will emerge — indeed, perhaps even *which* universities will emerge — in an adequately strong condition to continue the many roles that society has come to expect of them. It is a time of self-consciousness in higher education, a time in which institutions of learning are again probing their own fundamental purposes and asking how those purposes might be shaped to the constraints and opportunities of a new age.

This Mission Statement reflects the new mood. It attempts a contemporary expression of the purposes of the State University of New York at Albany. It is done for our own guidance so that we may move forward without loss of strength or character. It is openly reported for the understanding of the public that sustains us and receives our services.

The Mission Statement is the opening essay in a planning process which is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Planning, under the direction of Robert Shirley. The Statement was first issued September 8, 1976, under the title of a "Proposed Statement of Mission" and was accompanied by an invitation to faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the University to offer their reactions, criticisms, and suggestions for improvement. Many groups and individuals did respond. All responses were reviewed by the Council on Educational Policy of the University Senate, and the Council has recommended changes in the shape and substance of the document. (The Council report is on file in the University Senate Office.) The recommendations have been incorporated in this revised Mission Statement of January 7, 1977.

There has been a major change in the general organization of the document so that the concept of a university (now Part I) is given greater clarity. In addition, the

Mission Statement proper now focuses more on the permanent elements of mission and on criteria for institutional development, with shorter-term applications of those criteria appearing as appendices. Other changes in format were adopted in order to improve readability.

More specific changes are these:

• *Introduction* — the historical perspective now appears in the introduction, followed by a statement of the purpose and scope of the complete document.

• *Part I: The Concept of a University* — this part states the values of universities generally and affirms the importance of those values at the University of Albany. The importance of excellence in undergraduate education and in teaching have been made more explicit, as well as the importance of quality in general.

• *Part II: The Institutional Setting* — two major elements of the institutional setting are discussed here: the SUNY system and location in the Capital District of New York. Public policy analysis as an institutional emphasis is discussed at greater length than in the original draft, in order to clarify the University's position on various issues raised by respondents.

• *Part III: Goals for Student Development* — this part has been revised substantially to be clearer about our obligations to the "whole person" and to discuss the goals of learning in more general terms. The Council deemed it inappropriate to include a detailed listing of specific learning objectives in a general campus-level mission statement.

• *Part IV: Goals for Societal Development* — the major change made in this part is elimination of detailed objectives under each goal, again because the Council thought the level of specificity too extensive for a general document.

• *Part V: Programs and Priorities* — this part combines Parts V and VI of the original draft and focuses on criteria for academic and administrative priority-setting, rather than on the priorities themselves.

• *Part VI: Toward Implementation* —

the emphasis of this part is now on the process of planning by academic and administrative units, as well as the role of faculty, staff, and students in implementing the mission.

• *Appendices A and B* — the two appendices delineate the academic and administrative priorities of the University for the current period.

Academic and administrative units of the University are presently developing statements of their own objectives, along with three-year development plans, and these will be available for consideration in late January 1977. The campus level Mission Statement gives general guidance to these more concrete and particular reflections of campus planning activities. After January as the unit plans are reviewed, additional revisions in the campus-level statement may become warranted. Each year hereafter, we expect that the Council on Educational Policy will wish to reexamine these documents to determine whether any alterations in goals and priorities have become desirable.

The University is indebted, and I am personally grateful, to a great many persons whose labors are making this planning process a reality — to Dr. Shirley who directs it, to the Council on Educational Policy which is its constructive critic, to the many groups and individuals who are responding with helpful suggestions, to the schools and departments whose faculty and staff are working hard in behalf of strong unit plans, and to many others who wish the University success. Whatever this Mission Statement may offer in clarity and quality results from the fact that these people worked to make it so. I am keenly aware of my responsibilities as President in such a venture as this, and I assume personal responsibility for any shortcomings the planning process may still have. It is important, however, that we have begun.

Emmett B. Fields
President

January 7, 1977

INTRODUCTION

The University at Albany has a rich and eventful past, a past that has always been characterized by a strong focus upon education of high quality. Its reputation as an institution of higher education is strong and its list of notable graduates is lengthy. The mission of the institution reflects this persistent commitment to quality and to an academic reputation of strength.

The Growth of a College: 1844-1962

Founded in 1844 as the State Normal School (later changed to New York State Normal College), the institution's primary purpose for its first 60 years was the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools. In 1905, the mission changed dramatically: all courses of study designed to prepare elementary school teachers were discontinued; admissions requirements were made essentially the same as those of other eastern colleges of good standing; and all students were required to pursue subjects deemed essential to a liberal education. Also in 1905, the institution was authorized to award the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Through these changes the College was committed to preparing a liberally educated person who was also competent to teach in the secondary schools.

The succeeding decades saw that commitment fulfilled. Under the leadership of William J. Milne, Abram R. Brubacher and John M. Sayles, a faculty noted for its devotion to liberal education was recruited; and the distinction between a "teachers' college" and a "college for teachers" was transformed from a semantic subtlety into an instructional reality. Though the size of the College changed little during this period, its intellectual development proceeded robustly, as evidenced by a lateral growth into the full range of arts and sciences and a vertical growth into masters programs geared to the continuing professional needs of teachers.

In 1948, along with its sister public institutions, the College became a part of the newly established State University of New York. Its primary mission remained unchanged, however, and it was not until September 1961 that the College enrolled its first class of undergraduate students in liberal arts programs which did not include any required study in teacher education. In 1962, the institution was designated as one of four university centers to be developed in the SUNY system. Thus began a rapid transition to a complex university center for graduate, professional, and undergraduate education.

The Growth of a University: 1962-1971

In the decade following its designation as a university center, the Albany campus experienced rapid growth in program offerings, enrollments, and resources. The number of academic departments tripled, enrollments and faculty quadrupled, library holdings increased tenfold, and a new physical plant was constructed and occupied. The growth was more than numeric and physical, of course, and the sense of quality expected of a major university permeated decisions made on program development, faculty recruitment, and student admissions. Visible evidence of the continued emphasis placed on quality during the growth era can be seen in the test scores of entering students, the scholarly achievements of faculty, the existence of numerous honor societies, and the high demand for admission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The initiation of a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in March 1974 finds its roots in the insisted emphasis on quality throughout the new University's first decade.

The range of programs appropriate to a major university developed rapidly. By the end of the decade the University was offering 49 baccalaureate programs, 52 masters programs, and 28 programs at the doctoral level. Thus the dominant feature of the era was growth: not unplanned or undirected expansion, but growth on the broad front of program activity necessitated by the times.

Little attention had to be given to the question of institutional mission under such expansionist conditions, because existing programs were assured of continuing resources, and proposals for new or expanded programs had only to contend against each other for shares of an ever-increasing budget. When steady-state conditions emerged rather abruptly in the early 1970's, in New York and elsewhere, few institutions were prepared to adjust to the prospect of equilibrium or of decline in program activity. The University at Albany was no exception.

The Recent Past: 1971-Present

The University at Albany began earlier than most universities in facing up to the implications of steady-state financing, by adopting redeployment strategies in the early 1970's to cope with shifts in workload patterns resulting from the elimination of all distribution requirements for baccalaureate degrees. The redeployments were ad hoc in nature, however, and were based on a narrow assessment of the circumstances peculiar to one or more

programs at the time, rather than being guided by a more comprehensive plan for institutional development.

The work of the Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities in 1975 represented a significant break with that pattern. That group recommended position redeployments and program cuts within a comprehensive assessment of academic programs in which no single recommendation was made final prior to an examination of the whole. The work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources in early 1976 continued this approach to making resource allocation decisions.

While neither the Select Committee nor the Presidential Task Force was charged with delineating long-range developmental priorities for the campus, the work of both focused attention on the need for such a plan. The Select Committee anticipated that need in 1975 by warning the campus of the implications of limited resources:

... In the view of the Select Committee, this University Center cannot continue to attempt a full speed "horizontal development" on all levels. It simply cannot do everything at once and do it well. It is the responsibility of all persons on this campus — administration, faculty, and students — to make a more effective case for increasing Albany's share of state tax dollars. But even under the most optimistic circumstances, we are not likely to see huge increases in faculty lines for the Albany campus in the near future. We must become much more selective in our goals and wisely choose among the options available...¹

The harsh reality of a declining budget formed the context in which the Presidential Task force met in 1976 to determine options for the future. There was no fully developed mission statement available for guidance, as the Council on Educational Policy observed in its review of the Task Force's recommendations. Those recommendations had been undertaken on the assumption that a formal plan would be forthcoming, however, and the Council recommended that any future evaluations entailing resource redis-

1. Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities, "The General Report," May 15, 1975, p. 26.

tribution be done "in the context of a coherent institutional plan"

The future of the campus must be guided by more than a broad and generally unstated sense of purpose. Our circumstances in this regard are not unique; if any institution of higher education is to make effective use of increasingly scarce resources, decisions about those resources must reflect *prior* determinations on goals and developmental priorities. We must not only be more selective in our choices as to what is important but also ensure that those choices are subsequently reflected in budgetary decisions.

This Mission Statement is the beginning of a process for defining future

directions of the University at Albany, a framework within which priority decisions can be made and implemented. It initiates the "coherent institutional plan" called for last year by the Council on Educational Policy.

The five parts of the Statement as printed here proceed from general educational values that shape the missions of all universities, to more concrete expressions of institutional purpose that are particular to the University at Albany, to criteria for setting priorities appropriate to institutional goals. The five parts are intended to have a degree of permanence that will allow reaching beyond the confines of yearly budget-making to the

formulation of long-term development strategies. The institution's current priorities are presented, also, but since emphases are likely to be modified over a period of years, the immediate priorities are presented in two appendices.

This much of the Mission Statement anticipates its final and most important part — the goals of the schools, divisions, and departments of the University. Three-year plans, now being prepared by each academic and administrative unit, will be available for more general discussion in late January 1977. Those plans, when refined and approved for execution, will express concretely the newly-shaped mission of the University at Albany.

PART I: THE CONCEPT OF A UNIVERSITY

Institutions of higher learning may differ in many particulars, but they are inextricably bound by values which transcend considerations of location, ownership, and operational mode. The goals of the University at Albany must build upon and be shaped by the values of learning and scholarly inquiry which are at the heart of universities everywhere.

What are the principal values to which we are obligated as a university?

First is a *commitment to the discovery and advancement of knowledge*, for its own sake and for its practical benefits to society. Knowledge is an end in itself, the quest for which runs deep in the human spirit. Knowledge is also a source of enlightenment for the solution of many of society's problems, a force in the advancement of civilization. The world's great discoveries often occur in universities. The commitment to research and scholarly inquiry is the foundation of a university's unique role in society, and the wellspring of all of its functions.

A second fundamental obligation of a university is a *commitment to the teaching of students*, to their growth in knowledge, and to that reinforcement which will allow them to develop physically, emotionally, and socially as they grow intellectually. A university is obligated to stimulate in students a genuine excitement for learning and to equip them with a variety of intellectual strategies — in short, to provide a liberal education which aims at a larger self-fulfillment for every student. This holds true regardless of the chosen field of study, because specialized study without exposure to the ideas, principles, and theories central to all learning can only result in parochialism. A university affords also the specialized studies which lead to careers, particularly those professional careers

which are based upon advanced knowledge. The entire intellectual, recreational, and social environment of the campus comes into play in giving life to such a learning experience. The goals for student development presented in Part III of this document reflect a commitment to education of the whole person.

A third distinguishing characteristic of a university is its *commitment to the larger society through acts which, for lack of a better term, we generally call "public service."* This function is peculiarly evident in American universities. Research and teaching contribute to the public good, of course, but faculty and students often reach beyond the confines of their classrooms and laboratories to engage directly in community affairs. A keener understanding of the public condition is one road to public betterment, and a university has contributions to make in this regard. Part IV of this document says more about "Goals for Societal Development."

Research, teaching, and public service are compatible functions which draw strength from each other. Faculty publish the results of their scholarship for the enlightenment of their peers throughout the world. They thus hold custody of the age-old process by which knowledge is kept alive and expanded into unknown realms.

An active research faculty excites students with learning, opens their minds to the imaginative and creative elements of inquiry, equips them with analytical methods for judging the truth, leads them to the frontiers of research knowledge, and urges them on into their own inquiries and fresh understandings. The research scholar who isolates himself from students in uninterrupted study belongs in a research organization of

government or industry, and not in a university, because the hallmark of the university outlook is that research and teaching stimulate each other and should always proceed companionably. Research is, in much the same way, the wellspring of the public service function, the source from which come the analytic models which enable a better understanding of societal problems.

A fourth characteristic of a university is its *commitment to freedom of thought and inquiry*, and to the rights and obligations of faculty and students to pursue knowledge where it may lead. This basic value is essential to the advancement of knowledge, and to deny the right would be to imply that the results of scholarly inquiry, and the benefits to society, are entirely predictable in advance. The right to pursue one's own inquiries and freely to publish the results is an inviolable right of the investigator.

Freedom of thought and inquiry is just as essential to teaching as it is to research. The original statement on academic freedom prepared by the American Association of University Professors in 1915 argues the point convincingly:

It is scarcely open to question that freedom of utterance is as important to the teacher as it is to the investigator. No man can be a successful teacher unless he enjoys the respect of his students, and their confidence in his intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the student that the teacher is not expressing himself fully or frankly, or that college and university teachers in general

are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage which youth always demands in those whom it is to esteem. The average student is a discerning observer, who soon takes the measure of his instructor. It is not only the character of the instruction but also the character of the instructor that counts; and if the student has reason to believe that the instructor is not true to himself, the virtue of the instruction as an educative force is incalculably diminished. There must be in the mind of the teacher no mental reservation. He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is.²

The AAUP statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure of 1940 summarized the essential components of academic freedom:

- A. The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- B. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation

2. General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure presented to and adopted by the Annual Meeting of the Association, December 31, 1915. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. 1, Part 1 (December 1915), p. 28.

to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of the religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

- C. The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.³

The University at Albany is committed to preserving these rights of free inquiry and discussion, and to maintaining the high standards of scholarship which are attendant to such rights.

There is a fifth way to characterize a university. It offers undergraduate and graduate degrees, including the most advanced graduate degrees, in a wide range of liberal and professional fields of study. Knowledge has become so vast in the Twentieth Century that no single institution can be expected to develop in every field, and the financial constraints which emerged in the 1970's abjure every institution to avoid programmatic over-commitment. Without a reasonably broad

3. "Academic Freedom and Tenure," Statement of principles endorsed at the annual meeting of the Association on January 9, 1941. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Vol. 27, Number 1 (February 1941), p. 41.

PART II: THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

The common values of universities form a philosophic framework for goal-setting, but the character of every university is shaped also by the environment in which it exists and in which it acts out the basic values. A university builds its identity in part by its responsible adaptation to the constraints and opportunities of its own setting.

The University at Albany is conditioned by two major elements of environment: its membership in the State Univer-

sity of New York system, and its location in the Capital District of New York. Both elements pose obligations and opportunities.

The SUNY System

The State University of New York is the largest system of public higher education in the world. Comprising 64 institutions, it enrolled approximately 343,000 students in Fall 1976. By type,

range of undergraduate and graduate offerings in the humanities, fine arts, sciences, social sciences, and selected professional fields, however, an institution cannot lay claim to being a university.

This arises partially from the need to offer a range of programs essential to a liberal education, but it arises more forcefully from the fact that no discipline or field of study is an intellectual island. The fields of knowledge are interrelated. In many instances the mutually reinforcing nature of disciplines and fields is readily apparent, especially within the broad intellectual families which form natural groupings within a university. Interactions between these broad families exist even if not readily apparent. For example, the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences provide much of the theoretical underpinnings for advanced study in a variety of professional fields. In turn, the construction and testing of theories in the professional schools reinforces and adds to the store of knowledge in the underlying disciplines.

Finally, a university must be committed to standards of quality which earn it respect in all of its communities of interest, including the national and international community of universities. Excellence in teaching, high standards of scholarship, and fruitful address to public service make up the currency by which a university earns honored place in society. The meaning of "quality" is often blurred by disagreements over appropriate measurements, but this only directs us toward the development of elegant, effective, and rigorous modes of measurement.

The State University of New York at Albany is committed to all of the fundamental attributes of a university of the first class. It is through a shared commitment to such values that faculty, staff, and students are able to work together, both formally and informally, to shape the policies of the institution.

the constituent campuses include 30 community colleges; six agricultural and technical colleges; three specialized colleges, five statutory colleges; 14 arts and sciences colleges; two health science centers; and four university centers. Together the campuses offer the full range of postsecondary education from introductory to advanced levels. Advanced graduate and professional studies are concentrated in the four university centers at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony

Brook. The centers, which also admit undergraduate students, account for about one-sixth of SUNY enrollments. The Albany campus currently enrolls 14,673 students on all levels.

The University at Albany, as with the other university centers, has certain characteristics which distinguish it from other types of institutions in the system:

- It maintains an emphasis on research and teaching which stresses integration of the two activities and excellence in each.
- It maintains an extensive faculty of productive scholars in the humanities, fine arts, social and behavioral sciences, natural sciences and mathematics, and selected professional fields.
- It offers a broad range of baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degree programs in these fields of study.
- Its laboratories, libraries, and other physical facilities are those of a research university. The library is one of the 105 members of the Association of Research Libraries.
- Its enrollment mix includes a significant proportion of graduate and advanced professional students (about one-third) with an admixture of out-of-state and foreign students.
- Its intellectual climate is that of a research university in which the presence of broadly educated advanced students is a stimulation and challenge to beginning students.

These general features, common to each of the university centers, establish a context for their work which is distinctly national and international in character. Advanced degree holders graduating from the centers are competing nationally for employment. The University at Albany's various programs in international education, including the newly-established graduate exchange with Moscow State University, express the international character of campus interests.

While performing its role in this broader context, the University at Albany also serves many local and regional needs. Again it shares these local characteristics and responsibilities with the other university centers.

- It draws its full- and part-time student population heavily and broadly from New York State at the same time that a limited number of out-of-state and foreign students are also enrolled. New York students, by acquaintance with these associates from other places,

are drawn into a larger view of society.

- It offers a variety of cultural, clinical, and other activities which are designed to contribute to the development of students but which directly benefit area residents. Citizens of the Capital District attend campus cultural events, and they are frequently the beneficiaries of clinics and other organized activities related to instruction.
- It offers a variety of life-long learning opportunities for the population within its geographic region.
- Many members of the faculty find the topics and the materials for their scholarly inquiries in New York State, with the result that local and state problems are better understood while enlightenment is extended to national and international issues in which New York shares.
- The University Center is a major element of the regional economy, a principal employer of a highly trained work force and a major purchaser of goods and services.

These international, national, and regional characteristics of the Albany campus are compatible with the hallmarks of a university as outlined in Part I of this Mission Statement. Most fundamentally viewed, the Albany mission is to fill its place in the SUNY system by being a university of the first class, faithful to the values of universities everywhere and responsive to the opportunities of its wide region of the State of New York and the State Capital District.

One frequently hears universities described as "national" or "regional," and the clear implication is that an institution must choose whether it is to be a "great university" or merely a local one. The criteria which go into drawing the distinction are never made explicit, however. The University at Albany rejects any notion that its national reputation is diminished by its attentions to local problems.

The dilemma is more apparent than real, because there are a number of reasons for saying that national and regional goals can be pursued compatibly. First, the very essence of a major university is its commitment to the advancement of knowledge, regardless of whether the immediate benefit to society is measurable or immeasurable, tangible or intangible, long-run or short-run. The advancement of knowledge is a primary goal of all disciplines and fields of study. Herein lies the greatest contribution a university can make to its local communi-

ty or to the nation. When viewed in this way, the national and local dimensions of a university's work are mutually reinforcing and inseparable. Second, it is rare that the important issues and problems existing in one geographic region are of only nominal concern to another. Thus the expertise of a university can be brought to bear on basic issues which, although arising locally, are of universal concern. The advancement and application of knowledge to such issues can yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty, as well as to the local community. Third, the greatness of a university is judged by the *significance* of the issues its scholars address and by the *quality* of their address. These values know no geographic boundaries. If the conditions of universality are present, issues arising locally present opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge and for dissemination of the research results to students, scholars and practitioners. The issue of a "national" versus "local" focus becomes moot because the obligations intrinsic to both are fulfilled.

The University Center at Albany can, and must, meet both sets of expectations in order to provide leadership as a public institution of higher learning in New York State.

Needs and Opportunities in the Capital Region: An Institutional Focus on Public Policy Analysis

Location in the Capital District of New York presents unique needs and opportunities to the University at Albany. The existing and potential strengths of the University, in turn, constitute a major resource for governmental, industrial, cultural, and other organizations of the District.

The University addresses the needs of many external constituencies already, of course, and in a variety of ways: applied research on problems of concern to government and other agencies; life-long learning opportunities for area residents; technical assistance to various organizations; student internships in the community; evening classes to improve educational access; public performances and exhibits in the arts; and the provision of qualified graduates. These and other forms of public service to the community are important and will continue.

In addition to fulfilling these general services, the university must be specially attuned to the needs and opportunities of its own geography. What major needs for knowledge in the region would constitute educational opportunities for faculty and students? In one important sense the answer varies by discipline and field of

study, as individual scholars engage in basic and applied research efforts which draw upon resources unique to the institution and its location. From a campus-wide perspective, however, the problem of choice looms large, because basic decisions must be made among programs and projects which legitimately could be given high priority as an institutional focus for the future.

The University at Albany will place high priority on basic and applied research efforts which address policy issues of broad public concern. It will thus build to a compelling opportunity. The State of New York is currently faced with a variety of policy issues related to economic development, education, environmental management, social services, crime and the administration of justice, social justice and equality, energy use, and other areas of concern to the public. In addressing such problems, agency heads, legislators and other government officials are charged with developing appropriate goals for enhancement of the public good, defining the appropriate means for achieving those goals, and monitoring the results and taking corrective action where necessary. Regardless of the specific area of concern, fulfillment of these general responsibilities requires a strong base of research and training in a variety of forms. It is within this context that the University can fruitfully intersect the process of policy formation — not necessarily through direct involvement in decision-making or implementation, but through generation of the knowledge needed to undergird that process. Our location in the seat of State government and our faculty competence provide a strong base for further development of an institutional emphasis on public policy analysis. The University has only begun to tap the vast learning laboratory which surrounds it.

Adoption of this focus can be accomplished in a way which reinforces the University's obligation to develop the intellectual capacities of students and to discover new knowledge. There are educational benefits to be gained for both students and faculty, as well as opportunities for the advancement of knowledge on a variety of fronts. At the same time that the region will be benefitted, the focus should also influence the national and international character of the University. The economic, social, and technological problems facing this State are not unique. Other regions of the

nation and world have, or will have, many of the same concerns.

It is important to recognize clearly what an institutional emphasis on policy analysis must *not* mean, as well as what it can and should become.

First, the beneficiaries must be the general public and not merely the public's servants in government. The University cannot be captive to partisan interests, because its strength lies in an impartial search for the truth. Freedom of inquiry is fundamental to the nature of a university in this way as in all other ways. While important research questions often can be mutually identified by faculty and governmental officials, an independent and non-partisan view of the issues must be maintained.

Second, issues which are important to the State of New York will rarely be in geographic isolation. Policies on energy use or economic development, for example, cannot be formulated for New York without influencing, and being influenced by, policies formulated in other states, at the federal level, and indeed in other countries of the world. The research perspective of the University cannot be geographically isolated, either, and must be as broad as the problems we seek to illuminate.

Third, it is important to stress that both basic and applied research are crucial to a focus on policy analysis. Not all faculty should be expected to engage in applied research, even in those units of the University which are or may become heavily committed to policy analysis. Support must be maintained for research which has little immediate relevance to public issues, but which provides the necessary theoretical base for more applied efforts. Without strong support for basic research in all programs, the intellectual horizons of policy analysis would become unduly limited. Knowledge must be *applied* if it is to avail solutions to public problems, however, and researchers who are interested in applications will be necessary to the enterprise.

The interests of public policy makers and the interests of faculty researchers will not always coincide, but they do intersect in potentially fruitful ways. In general, several criteria should be met in order for policy issues to be appropriate for address in the University setting:

- The issues and problems should be amenable to the application of rigorous research methodologies and techniques.

- They should not be so narrowly defined as to preclude generalizable conclusions.
- The benefits to be realized from address of the problems and issues should be of sufficient intellectual importance to warrant our commitment.
- Address to the issues and problems should yield significant educational benefits to students and faculty.
- The University should possess the expertise necessary for successful address to the issues and problems, or have the potential for attracting such expertise.
- The prerogative of the faculty to define the content and methodology of specific research efforts must be preserved in order to ensure freedom of inquiry and an independent, objective assessment of research results.

One mechanism for encouraging and facilitating policy research will be a university-wide Center for Governmental Research and Services, the role of which is discussed in Appendix B of this report.

Finally and most fundamentally, it is necessary to recognize that a university may choose some special intellectual emphases for itself but it should not be wholly contained by those emphases. To contain knowledge is ultimately to kill learning. It is appropriate that the University at Albany give emphasis to public policy studies, because it is near to the seat of New York government and it possesses a strong base of faculty competence which can be brought to bear on policy issues. It is not likely, however, that all disciplines of the University will adopt such a focus, nor is it desirable that all do so. It is entirely appropriate that some disciplines have little or no direct impact on public policy formation, although there is no field of study which does not contribute to the education of students and therefore, in a broad sense, to the public good. We must preserve and nurture all disciplines which are essential for education of the whole person and be satisfied with nothing less than excellence in all that we do. The emphasis on matters of public policy is an enlargement of mission to embrace the needs and opportunities inherent in our immediate environment.

PART III: GOALS FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

A statement of goals for student development should identify the desired outcomes, or results, of the University experience. In adopting this outcomes orientation, one must distinguish between the ultimate consequences of achieving the goals and the goals themselves. Achievement of whatever goals are set should contribute to the ability of students to (1) function effectively as educated persons in society; (2) assume the responsibilities of both leadership and citizenship within society; (3) engage in a life-long learning process of self-development; and (4) engage in meaningful and productive careers.

These consequences are a function of multiple variables, many of which are either beyond the scope of a university's work or beyond its control. Thus while a university cannot, indeed should not, assume full responsibility for the life success or failure (however defined) of its graduates, it must assume the responsibility for facilitating student development through accomplishment of the goals which it adopts as its rightful obligations.

A university distinguishes itself from other institutions in society by being specially concerned with the intellectual development of its students, with their growth in knowledge. Intellectual growth cannot occur separately from emotional, social, and physical development, however, and an effective learning environment recognizes and interrelates all of these aspects in order to foster wholesome personal achievement. A university must be committed to education of the whole person.

Students who matriculate in a university have already had at least 12 years of schooling, of course, and the skills and competencies that a university must impart are of the higher order that is appropriate to knowledge in its most advanced forms. Fields of study characterized by routine learning, which demand little of students beyond a simple acquisition of facts, do not attain to the level or the spirit of university studies. By contrast, university studies are of sufficient complexity to require advanced skills of analysis and critical thinking, a high order of methodological sophistication, and vigorous pursuit of the disciplines of learning. Students can be both "trained" in the specialized studies that lead to careers, and "educated" to a broader understanding of nature and mankind.

Students individually form and integrate their own goals for intellectual development, with an eye both to understanding the human condition and to

career preparation, and their personal, social, and physical development proceeds as they do so. The university is obligated to be the environment in which such human development may advance in a wholesome fashion.

The philosophical goals stated below reflect the University at Albany's commitment to education of the whole person and constitute broad guidelines for the design of educational programs, curricula, and supporting services. Though implementation strategies will vary from area to area, the goals are applicable to undergraduate and graduate education as well as to offices of administrative services.

GOAL I. TO DEVELOP SKILLS OF CRITICAL THINKING AND REASONING

The University seeks to develop in students the ability to acquire both general and specialized knowledge; to integrate knowledge from a variety of perspectives; to apply alternative modes of reasoning and methods of problem solution; to distinguish the logically relevant from the irrelevant; and to derive and formulate general principles for clarification and explanation.

GOAL II. TO DEVELOP AND FOSTER THE PROCESS OF INTELLECTUAL DISCOVERY AND THE EXPLORATION OF THE UNKNOWN

By focusing on the creative elements of learning and the importance of fostering intellectual curiosity, the University encourages an awareness of the imaginative and creative elements of intellectual endeavor; develops in students a familiarity with the philosophies and methods of research in a variety of academic disciplines; and promotes an attitude of individuality which results in intellectual self-awareness and initiative.

GOAL III. TO DEVELOP AN AWARENESS OF AND INTEREST IN THE BREADTH OF HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT AND CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

A broad understanding of world cultures and of the diversity of forms in which intellectual and artistic achievements have been expressed are important characteristics of the educated person. Students should be encouraged to gain an historical and integrated perspective of the cultural, political, legal, scientific, and social components of various societies

and to understand the processes, complexities, and consequences of change. The University must also strive to foster a life-long interest in intellectual and artistic endeavors in order to ensure continuing personal development.

GOAL IV. TO FACILITATE EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CLARIFICATION OF PERSONAL VALUES

The University seeks to foster in students a positive self-concept, a feeling of personal worth and psychological well-being; to develop an awareness of how emotions, attitudes, and values influence thought and behavior; to encourage clarification of personal values; and to foster a sense of personal responsibility for one's views and acts.

GOAL V. TO FACILITATE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

A wide range of communicative and leadership skills and the ability to interact effectively with others are essential attributes of an educated person, and the University must provide for development of these skills. Exposure to a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds is also a hallmark of the educated person, and the University is obligated to facilitate interaction and enhance understanding among the many segments of the University community.

GOAL VI. TO FACILITATE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING

The University is committed to the health, safety, and security of the University community, and provides physical activity, recreation, and other leisure-time activities necessary to the well-rounded development of students. We are obligated to create and maintain a healthy, clean, and psychologically and physically supportive campus environment that includes appropriate medical, housing, recreational, and educational programs.

GOAL VII. TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR PERSONALLY SATISFYING CAREERS

The University has an obligation to develop in students the knowledge and skills required for employment and advancement in professional fields of endeavor. In those of our fields of study which have traditionally led to clearly

defined careers, the curriculum should equip students with the knowledge and skills necessary for entry level employment. In those fields which have not traditionally led to clearly defined careers, students should be encouraged to develop supplementary skills which would qualify them for career entry of some useful and remunerative nature. In seeking to achieve these results, the University also should provide a variety of opportunities for students to gain work experiences in appropriate fields; encourage an orientation to careers that recognizes both sequential and non-sequential employment patterns and considerations of life-style; provide appropriate career counseling to students; and give direct assistance in obtaining employment.

GOAL VIII. TO MAINTAIN A CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT WHICH WILL FOSTER A SENSE OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

A sense of community is critical to the

achievement of all of the objectives of an institution of higher learning. The University must demonstrate, in its pursuit of learning, a commitment to the ideals and values of social responsibility, affirmative action, and equality of opportunity. The current epoch of United States history displays a strong American conscience about the condition of ethnic minorities in our culture—and the condition of women—and the University must assume its rightful obligations in bringing about social amelioration. These values must be communicated to students through words and example.

In addition, opportunities must continue to be provided for students to participate meaningfully in University decision-making processes, in community activities and governmental processes, and in a broad spectrum of cultural events. In general, what is sought is an atmosphere that will encourage students to explore and discuss contemporary social issues, to become aware of inherent conflicts in societal value choices, and to become

committed to act upon their enlightened beliefs toward improvement of society.

These Goals for Student Development are intended to reflect the full University experience and are, of necessity, stated broadly. It is the role of individual units within the University to articulate more precisely the goals of learning which are reflective of the unique discipline, field, or area of service to students. The desired outcomes discussed here apply to *all* students of the University at Albany and thus provide, in conjunction with Part IV of this document, the basic framework for goal articulation by academic and administrative units.

PART IV: GOALS FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT

The three basic functions of any major university are the discovery, transmittal, and application of knowledge on behalf of students and society. The functions are interrelated, of course, and they are accomplished through the activities of teaching, research, and consultation — each of which represents service to society. In this sense, "public service" is an outcome, or end result, of *all* our work and not some separately identifiable set of activities as commonly presumed. Such an understanding of "service" is long overdue in universities everywhere and necessary for full understanding of our goals and objectives for societal development. The following paragraphs discuss briefly the primary outcomes associated with the three major functions.

The potential benefits to society resulting from the *discovery of knowledge* are frequently unknown or unpredictable in any immediate sense, and even more difficult to measure. On the other hand, much knowledge discovered as a result of basic research in universities has had immediate visibility and utility to society. In general, discovery efforts have the primary outcome of advancement of knowledge, the visibility of which varies by discipline and field, but the importance of which has been demonstrated innumerable times. The University at Albany is committed to the discovery of knowledge for knowledge's sake, that foundation on which universities have

been built as unique institutions within society.

With regard to the *application of knowledge*, the outcomes or benefits to society generally emerge from a problem-oriented focus, primarily through the activities of research and consultation. Thus, whereas the discovery function tends to be concept-oriented, the application function focuses initially on specific concerns of society. The distinction is often vague at best, and little is to be gained by attempting to classify too finely various types of research as "basic" or "applied." Nonetheless, the conceptual distinction is useful, particularly when addressing the larger issue of a university's role within society. In general, the result of the application function can be thought of as problem analysis, putting to work the varied resources of the university on important concerns of society or components thereof.

The first goal stated below reflects the University's commitment to research and scholarly inquiry for its own sake, as well as its commitment to utilize the results of such efforts, where appropriate, to assist in the solution of specific societal problems. Thus basic and applied research efforts contribute in equal importance to "societal development," and both demand a strong theoretical and methodological base within a university.

The *transmittal of knowledge* also has clearly identifiable outcomes to society.

In some forms, the transmittal of knowledge is indistinguishable from its application, as students carry forth the results of classroom and laboratory work for use in later life. The university also has an obligation to transmit the results of its discoveries to students, the scholarly community, and the general public through books, journal articles, exhibitions, and other forms. As used here, however, transmittal in a university setting occurs primarily through teaching, whether that activity be for degree or non-degree students. In this sense, the primary outcome or result of transmittal is educated human beings. The goals for student development presented in Part III also apply here, but the University is also obligated to offer opportunities for life-long learning which are uniquely directed to the local community. The second goal presented below reflects this obligation.

The transmittal of knowledge also occurs indirectly when cultural and clinical services are provided to the general public as part of the normal instructional process. For example, student internship programs of various types not only enhance learning, but also provide direct assistance to individuals and organizations in the local area. Similarly, productions or exhibits in the fine arts contribute importantly to student development and at the same time provide a valuable cultural resource for area residents. Thus, the third and final goal listed below

reflects the importance of such services in the life of a university.

In summary, the interrelated functions of discovery, application, and transmittal generate four major outcomes for society: *advancement of knowledge* (Goal I below); *problem analysis* (Goal I below); *educated people* (Goal II below, plus all the goals for student development presented in Part III of this document); and *cultural and clinical services* (Goal III below). "Public service" as used here is the overarching construct which embraces the four types of outcomes, because *all* our work is done on behalf of society. The analysis of public policy issues, for example, is only one form of problem analysis which, in turn, is only one of the four principal components of public service rendered by any major university.

In striving to achieve these goals, the University at Albany is firmly committed to high standards of social responsibility, including equality of opportunity and affirmative action in admissions decisions and in the hiring and retention of faculty and staff. Unless this commitment is fully realized in practice, the University cannot effectively discharge its obligations to the disadvantaged and to the larger society. The campus' Affirmative Action Plan reflects this commitment.

GOAL I. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE GENERAL ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND TO THE SOLUTION OF SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

The University must encourage individual faculty and students to undertake research and scholarly inquiry of any

nature which promises to contribute to the advancement of knowledge. Where appropriate, research on policy issues of public concern also will be encouraged, recognizing that the address of such issues should meet the criteria outlined in Part II of this document. As a means of facilitating scholarly inquiry of all types, the University must strive to increase the level of financial support available for research and to develop more effective structures for interdisciplinary address of complex questions or problems. Finally, the communication of research findings to peers, students, and interested persons outside the academic community must be given adequate support.

GOAL II. TO OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR LIFE-LONG LEARNING AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The University should offer degree and non-degree programs which are consistent with the needs of the learning society and with the capabilities of the University. All schools and departments are encouraged to offer life-long learning opportunities, both undergraduate and graduate, as appropriate to their missions; to provide, through course scheduling, and other means, the opportunity for qualified area residents to enroll in courses offered as a part of ongoing degree programs; to develop, where feasible, off-campus instructional programs to meet the needs of area residents; and to ensure that such offerings meet established standards of quality. The University should also seek to cooperate with other providers of

PART V: PROGRAMS AND PRIORITIES

Previous sections of this document have discussed the educational philosophy and general goals of the University at Albany and thus establish a basic framework for institutional development and behavior. We turn now to the criteria which are expected to underlie decisions on the academic and administrative priorities of the institution. The need for priority-setting arises even more forcefully under conditions of limited resources, and we must assume the following:

- There will be only slight growth in the total enrollment on this campus. The SUNY Master Plan currently allows for growth to 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85, or seven percent above the current level.

- There will be little or no increase in the number of faculty and staff positions funded by the State in the foreseeable future.

- The physical capacity of the University at Albany will remain virtually unchanged, although there will be some flexibility to change the character of existing space.

- Increases in the operating budget of the institution will likely be limited to inflationary adjustments over the next few years.

Thus the institution must prepare itself for a future which is "steady-state" insofar as the quantitative elements of growth are concerned. If managed properly, however, there are significant resource-related opportunities available to us:

life-long learning opportunities in the Capital District to ensure complementary offerings.

GOAL III. TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL AREA THROUGH THE PROVISION OF CULTURAL AND CLINICAL SERVICES WHICH REINFORCE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

This goal can be accomplished in a variety of ways: by integrating work-action experiences (e.g., internships, clinical experiences) for students into curricula as appropriate; by encouraging faculty to provide technical consulting assistance in the resolution of local problems; by providing a variety of cultural events for faculty, staff, students, and area residents; by making available the facilities of the University for use by appropriate community groups; and by providing other services to the community which are consistent with, and reinforce, the educational mission of the institution.

While the goals listed above provide a commonality of purpose for all units of the University, each contributes to their accomplishment in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of emphasis. Thus it is not intended that each unit pursue all of the goals outlined. *As an institution*, however, we must be committed to the pursuit of them all and develop more effective means for assessing our degree of goal attainment.

- A limitation on total enrollments means that our attention can be centered on the qualitative aspects of growth, unfettered by erratic workload patterns and the usual crises associated therewith. Enrollment patterns *within* the University must be monitored closely to insure the attainment of educational goals.

- Although the total number of faculty funded by the State may remain constant, there will continue to be flexibility for the reallocation of positions.

- There are many first class programs and faculty now present on this campus. Selective development on a more compact operating front can expand those strengths still further. Although we must build from existing strengths, other programs critical to future mission will be improved where feasible.

• Our present physical capacity is sufficient, by and large, for the projected enrollments on this campus. With careful management of the space available, appropriate reallocations can be accomplished. Moreover, the *quality* of the physical plant is, by most yardsticks, excellent.

• While we may see no increases in the total operating budget aside from inflationary adjustments, there is flexibility for reallocation in this area also. By no means is our operating budget so small as to prevent the selective development of excellence on this campus.

These opportunities and constraints have several implications for future mission. First, resource allocation decisions must be guided by an explicit statement of priorities for the future. We can no longer expand on an even-handed basis, nor can all programs be developed to equivalent sizes or levels of quality. Second, we must increase our efforts at obtaining funds from non-State sources. New financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support for students and for faculty research, and to support the further development of selected programs. Third, the budgeting process of the future must be strongly influenced by a reallocation approach, the major objective being to provide those resources necessary for attainment of the goals established and for elimination of inequities in staffing which may exist. Finally, we must intensify efforts to identify ways by which costs can be reduced without corresponding reductions in effectiveness.

Academic Program Offerings

All universities are constrained in their range of program offerings for both educational and economic reasons. The reduction of twenty degree programs (later changed to 18) on the Albany campus this past year reflected a shared realization that an inventory of 129 programs could not be supported at the requisite level of quality in the years ahead. The range of programs sustained is befitting of a university, however, and the work of the Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources left the institution wholesomely formed for the future.

The Task Force members did not have the benefit of a written statement of mission to guide their deliberations. Nonetheless, there was ready comprehension of the general future of this University, especially its role as a major university center, the nature of any university's obligations to students and to society, and the increasing attention to be given to policy issues of public concern. The criteria used for program evaluation con-

stitute evidence of this understanding, as does the final report itself.

The President's Report on Priorities and Resources, dated March 15, 1976, set forth the programs to be sustained on the Albany campus. As indicated below, the inventory includes 42 programs at the bachelor's level (including five interdisciplinary programs), 48 at the master's level, 21 at the doctoral level, and eight University certificate programs. In addition, the University will continue its commitment to the Educational Opportunities Program, to which we admit students who have the potential to engage in university-level work but who have some deficiency in academic preparation and who are economically disadvantaged.

Bachelor's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (15) – Art, Classics (Greek, Latin, and Greek & Roman Civilization), English, French, German, Italian, Judaic Studies, Music, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communication, Russian, Spanish, Theatre. (Course sequences will continue in Art History and Polish.)

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (9) – African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Puerto Rican Studies, Social Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (8) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Geology, Mathematics, Medical Technology, Physics, (A second field will continue in Computer Science.)

School of Education: (1) – Business Education. (A second field will continue in Education.)

School of Business: (2) – Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Public Affairs: (1) – Political Science.

School of Social Welfare: (1) – Social Welfare.

Interdisciplinary Programs: (5) – Asian Studies, Chinese, Computer Science & Applied Math, Linguistics, Russian & East European Studies. (Interdisciplinary second fields will continue in Journalism, Peace Studies, Urban Studies and Women's Studies. Several departments will also continue to offer courses in environmental analysis.)

Master's Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (13) – Classics (Classical Archeology, Greek, and Latin), English, French, German, Italian, Philosophy, Rhetoric & Communication, Russian, Spanish, Studio Art, Theatre.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (8) – African & Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, Social Studies, Sociology.

Division of Science and Mathematics: (7) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (12) – Counseling, Curriculum Planning, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Psychology, General Professional, Reading, Rehabilitation Counseling, Special Education, Student Personnel Services, Teacher Education, TESL – Bilingual Education.

School of Business: (2) – Accounting, Business Administration.

School of Library and Information Science: (1)

School of Social Welfare: (1)

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (3) – Political Science, Public Administration, Public Affairs.

Doctoral Degree Programs

Division of Humanities: (4) – English (Ph.D. and D.A.), German, Philosophy, Spanish.

Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences: (5) – Anthropology, Economics, History, Psychology, Sociology, (temporarily suspended).

Division of Science and Mathematics: (6) – Atmospheric Science, Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics.

School of Education: (2) – Ph.D., Ed.D.

School of Criminal Justice: (1)

School of Public Affairs: (2) – Political Science, Public Administration.

School of Social Welfare: (1) – (temporarily suspended)

University Certificate Programs

School of Education: (7) – Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, Educational Communications, Educational Research, Reading, Student Personnel Services.

School of Education and Social & Behavioral Sciences: (1) – School Psychology.

This program array represents a rich diversity of disciplines and fields, encompassing the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and selected professional schools. Accompanying the diversity is a high degree of intellectual interdependence, and a shared commitment to those values and principles of

scholarly inquiry which are at the very heart of a university.

There are four major expectations of *all* programs being sustained:

• Achievement of a level of quality befitting a university center, as measured by rigorous national standards of scholarship.

• Development and pursuit of goals and objectives which reflect the unique character of the discipline or field, but which are also compatible with the overall goals of the University.

• Achievement of a balanced emphasis on teaching and research.

• Implementation of faculty evaluation, reward, and development plans which are appropriate to a university center.

These expectations constitute the primary focal points for coordination and oversight of programs from a campus-wide perspective. The forms of scholarship to be taken as evidence of achievement will differ across academic units, but there should be no variations in the level of accomplishment expected. Continued development as a university center demands the maintenance of high performance standards for both students and faculty in all programs offered on the Albany campus. As a corollary, the University must provide all programs being sustained the support needed to fulfill this commitment to quality.

Academic Priorities

A statement of program priorities reflects the fact that, during a given period of the institution's life, some programs need additional resources and/or attention more than do others. There are three principal factors to be considered in identifying those academic units which are primary claimants on resources:

• The obligation of the institution to provide *all* programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.

• The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.

• The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three major factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. The question which must be given a satisfactory answer can be stated thusly: What is the critical mass of scholars and support

resources needed in a given unit to (a) provide the needed breadth and depth of intellectual expertise, (b) accommodate planned enrollments, and (c) accomplish the range of intellectual activities expected of all faculty at a major university center? Some quantitative workload indices can be employed to help answer this question, but all such factors must be weighed in relation to the unique features of a given discipline or field. Judgment is involved here, certainly, but these interrelated conditions must be satisfied in all programs to be offered on the Albany campus. Hence any unit which is judged to be below critical mass at a given time must be designated as a priority claimant on resources.

The second factor to be considered in delineating priorities takes cognizance of (a) the University's commitment to achieve peaks of excellence among its programs and (b) the obligation of the institution to facilitate and sustain extraordinary achievements on the part of its faculty. There are academic units on campus which have attained, or are close to attaining, national stature. Still others have strong potential to become recognized as among the leaders in the discipline or professional field. The University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate.

The third factor reflects the increased emphasis to be placed by the University on address to public policy matters. As discussed in Part II, this particular element of University mission can take a variety of forms and will be encouraged in all appropriate disciplines and fields. However, certain units or parts thereof have demonstrated special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear rather directly and immediately on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York. Such units will be given particular encouragement to expand their work in policy analysis and thus to contribute to fulfilling this element of mission.

Appendix A identifies those academic units which, based on the three principal criteria, emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time. Any listing of priorities must be tempered by the uncertainty of future allocations by the State, and by the knowledge that the needs of specific programs can shift rapidly in a short period of time. The existence of such uncertainty does not make less important the need for institutional planning, however, as individual academic units must be given more adequate lead time for recruitment and internal planning in general. Uncertainty as to future

events means only that we must build a degree of flexibility into planned allocations and recognize that any resource may be subject to change in one or more of its parts. Thus the *intent* for future allocations can be clearly established, while recognizing that deviations from the plan may be necessary as external events unfold and as unanticipated needs emerge in specific programs.

Most of the priority concerns of an institution are directly related to the needs of academic schools and departments. However there also are educational matters which transcend disciplinary boundaries and merit special attention by the institution as a whole during given time periods. As elaborated more fully in Appendix A, there are five such matters which are of particular importance at this time: review of the undergraduate experience; assessment of learning outcomes; interdisciplinary studies; international education; and the future enrollment mix of the University.

Administrative Functions and Priorities

The administrative, or non-instructional, staff of the University exist to facilitate and support the work of faculty and students and, in certain cases, to contribute directly to the development of students. In keeping with these purposes, major functions of administration are to:

• Initiate development of the institutional plans, policies and procedures necessary to preserve and enhance the vitality of the intellectual enterprise as a whole.

• Acquire the resources necessary to support teaching, research, and learning, both directly through its own efforts and indirectly through provision of information on funding sources and other matters to faculty and students.

• Develop and maintain programs and services which contribute directly to the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of students within the context of a total learning environment.

• Provide those administrative services to faculty and students which either directly support the learning process or are necessary to its existence.

• Maintain appropriate relationships with various external publics to facilitate the work of faculty and students and to satisfy accountability requirements in both educational and economic terms.

• Develop and maintain appropriate means of coordination and oversight to ensure that the goals and priorities of the institution are accomplished as effectively and efficiently as possible.

These major functions provide the framework within which all administra-

tive units must articulate their goals and objectives to support the educational mission of the institution.

The process of priority-setting among administrative units of the University follows much the same logic as for academic units. First, there are particular

units which may be designated as primary claimants on resources during a given time period because they fall below the critical mass needed to fulfill their educational or administrative purposes. Second, there are broad issues which transcend the work of any particular unit and merit

special study by the administration as a whole. Overriding these specific priorities is the University's commitment to nurture and support adequately *all* activities necessary to the learning environment. Appendix B delineates the major priorities for the administration at this time.

PART VI: TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

This document has focused on defining the general goals and priorities of the University at Albany. It is a statement of intent, designed as a broad framework within which to describe and oversee future development of the institution. As such, it is intended to have a degree of permanence that enables individual units to develop their own longer-term goals and development strategies. The Mission Statement is nevertheless intended to be a working document, and not simply a periodic renewal of well-meant aspirations. It will achieve its purpose through implementation at two levels: the institutional process and the individual process.

The Institutional Process

The institutional process begins with preparation of three-year development plans by each academic and administrative unit. Each dean is currently coordinating, reviewing, and commenting upon plans within the school or division; similarly, each vice-president will be the focal point for administrative plans. All plans will be reviewed and discussed with appropriate academic and administrative officers during February, March, and April in order to achieve mutual understanding of future directions.

As this phase of discussions is completed, the priority criteria previously

described (see Part V, above) can be applied to each plan as a basis for determining future resource allocations. The process should result in tentative allocations for 1978-79, thus providing a longer lead time for planning and recruitment than has been true in the past. The three-year horizon of the development plans will provide a future context for decisions, as well as make possible selective longer-term recruiting commitments for key positions.

Units will be asked to update their three-year development plans annually, thus providing a "moving" process whereby plans can incorporate new developments — for example, the results of external reviews or unforeseen changes in external conditions which may affect substantive elements of the plans. The campus-level mission statement will also be reviewed annually by the Council on Educational Policy to determine if changes are needed in overall goals and priorities of the institution. Every four years, the campus-level statement and the development plans of units will together provide the basis for preparation of the Master Plan required by SUNY-Central Administration. All these elements of institutional process provide the framework for continual assessment of goals and their degree of attainment.

The Individual Process

The major responsibility for implementing the University's mission rests, of course, with faculty, staff, and students. That responsibility is, in many instances, individual in nature. For example, it is the responsibility and prerogative of the faculty to define the content and methodology of research efforts. It is also the responsibility of the faculty member to define a course and to specify how it will be taught, subject only to review by peers through established curriculum review processes. Similarly, it is the responsibility of individual students to strive for self-development and to take advantage of the learning opportunities provided by the University.

In other cases the responsibility for implementation is corporate, such as in the preparation of each unit's development plan and in the work of the various task forces referred to throughout this document. Whether individual or corporate, however, faculty, staff, and students must assume the primary obligation for initiating the actions that will fulfill this statement of mission. It is not self-enacting; effective performance within its framework is dependent upon a shared commitment to the values and goals of the University at Albany.

APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

As explained in Part V, there are three major factors to be considered in establishing which academic units have prior claim on resources at this time:

- The obligation of the institution to provide all programs the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.
- The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.
- The need to further develop instructional and research activities in those units which can contribute significantly

to the analysis of major public policy issues.

The first of the three factors establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to all academic units being sustained. As a result of shifts in student interests over the years, changes in program purposes and scope, and other factors, a number of units currently fall below the resources required. The following departments and schools should be given a net increase in faculty lines and associated support funds as soon as is feasible:

Business
Computer Science

Economics
English (increased resource needs satisfied in 1976-77)
History (increased resource needs satisfied in 1976-77)
Psychology
Public Administration
Rhetoric and Communication
Social Welfare
Sociology

The composition of this list will vary over time, of course, as circumstances change and as units not now listed experience the need for increased resources.

The second factor reflects the commitment to facilitate the attainment of peaks

of excellence within the University. Based on external evaluations and other forms of evidence, the following units either have attained positions of national leadership already or have the potential to do so in a reasonable period of time:

Anthropology
Art
Atmospheric Science
Biology
Chemistry
Criminal Justice
Educational Psychology
Geology
German
Mathematics
Philosophy
Physics
Public Administration
Reading

Resource augmentation is not necessarily called for in order to facilitate the achievement and/or maintenance of very high quality in the units listed. However, the University must nurture and facilitate extraordinary accomplishments in all possible ways, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate. The list is not immutable, of course, and should change as developmental efforts continue in other departments.

The third factor reflects the institutional emphasis on public policy analysis. The following schools and departments, or components thereof, have demonstrated special knowledge and skills which can be brought to bear on the economic, social, and scientific problems facing the State of New York:

Atmospheric Science
Business
Computer Science
Criminal Justice
Counseling and Personnel Services
Economics
Educational Policies, Programs and Institutions
Educational Psychology
Geography
Geology
Political Science
Psychology
Public Administration
Social Welfare
Sociology

While contributions to public policy analysis will be encouraged in many areas, the units listed above will be given particular encouragement in fulfilling this element of University mission.

Taking all three factors into account, 25 schools and departments emerge as primary claimants on resources at this time in order to (a) provide all units with an appropriate level of resources; (b) facilitate the attainment of national leadership; and (c) strengthen our work in

public policy analysis. The University must and will fulfill its obligation to provide the critical mass of resources needed in *all* academic units.

In addition to these unit priorities, Part V identified five educational concerns which need special attention by the institution as a whole at this time:

Review of the undergraduate experience — In keeping with the emphasis placed on education of the whole person in Part III, it is important to identify the desired outcomes of a liberal education and the most appropriate means for attaining those outcomes. The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience is already at work on the matter and expects to submit its recommendations in late Spring 1977. The Committee's report will be reviewed by appropriate governance bodies before final action is taken on any recommendations.

Assessment of learning outcomes — While institutions of higher education long have been concerned with the results of the learning process, little progress has been made in developing appropriate methods for assessing these results. The results of much of the University's work cannot be measured in a quantitative sense, to be sure, but we must develop more effective means for assessing how well we are doing in relation to goals established. It is important educationally that we evaluate results, and it is also important to provide the general public with evidence of accomplishments.

This stronger orientation toward a focus on learning outcomes and their assessment is being encouraged in all academic units of the University. For example, each unit has been encouraged to state its goals and objectives in terms of desired learning outcomes as a part of the three-year development plans now being prepared. This effort will yield new insights into both the benefits and limitations of such an approach.

Interdisciplinary studies. — As traditional intellectual families become increasingly interconnected, the ability to mount strong interdisciplinary programs will continue to be of major concern to all universities. A campus-wide mechanism is needed to ensure that needed programs are developed and, once in operation, given proper support and attention. The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience, the Undergraduate Academic Council, and the Office of the Academic Vice President are all addressing this issue, and recommendations for action should be forthcoming in 1977.

International education. — As indicated in Part III of the mission statement, an understanding and appreciation of

world cultures is an integral component of liberal learning. An emphasis on international education can be achieved in a variety of ways: through area studies programs, both on-campus and overseas; through the study of foreign languages and literature; through comparative and cross-cultural approaches in selected courses, regardless of the discipline or field of study; through a diverse student body which includes international students; and through other facets of the total experience which can be developed and emphasized.

The Special Committee to Review the Undergraduate Experience will consider this vital component of a liberal education in its work, but the matter should be reviewed continually by the International Studies Advisory Committee and by appropriate governance bodies and departments.

The enrollment mix of the campus. — As discussed in Part V, the total enrollment level authorized for the University at Albany is unlikely to change significantly in the near future. This does not mean, however, that the enrollment mix (e.g., by major, level) will remain constant, nor does it mean that the future mix must be left to chance. If educational considerations are to be given equal weight with demographic phenomena, we must initiate a more balanced approach to enrollment planning — one which reflects not only student interests but also the program plans and priorities of the institution and the societal needs being served.

Departments have already been asked to project, on a tentative basis, the enrollments which are *educationally desirable* over the next three years. The projections will be modified, of course, as departments prepare their plans over the coming months and as further discussions occur. Thus the campus-level guidelines at this stage of mission articulation must be limited to the following:

- The total enrollments on the Albany campus will not exceed the current Master Plan projections, i.e., 13,500 FTE students by 1980-81 and 14,000 FTE students by 1984-85. The total FTE enrollment in 1975-76 was approximately 13,175.
- On a headcount basis, the campus will seek to maintain the current mix of approximately two-thirds undergraduate students and one-third graduate.
- Recruitment efforts will be increased to ensure attraction of high quality students and to facilitate the enrollment of students with the potential for advanced work.
- New approaches will be developed to attract additional financial support for graduate students (see Appendix B).

APPENDIX B: ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIES

Part V of the mission statement indicated two major categories of administrative priorities: (1) those administrative units which may be identified as primary claimants on resources at this time, and (2) those broad issues which transcend the work of any particular unit and which merit special address by the institution. The development of departmental plans with a strong focus on the support of educational mission will provide much of the information needed for decisions on priorities in the first category. Thus the following focuses on the priorities for action which transcend the responsibilities of specific offices and deserve immediate attention by the administration.

Facilitation of Research

As defined in Part V of this report, the term "research" refers to a broad array of scholarly and artistic activities which differ considerably in form, content, and process across fields of study in the University. Faculty members at a university center assume an obligation to be engaged in creative forms of scholarly inquiry, and the administration, in turn, has an obligation to facilitate such activity in all ways possible. While facilitation is often constrained by requirements emanating from external sources, there are, nonetheless, ways by which both the quality and quantity of support for research can be improved. The following actions are either already underway or planned for the near future.

- A study was initiated in the Fall of 1976 to develop new methods of encouraging and facilitating research activities on a campus-wide basis. In general, the focus of the project is on (a) the elimination of any barriers to research which may exist; (b) the creation of appropriate incentives in a variety of forms; and (c) development of the means by which the research-related goals of the University can be most effectively accomplished.

- Through redeployment within the administration, one full-time professional staff member will be added to the Office of Research. Addition of this staff member will enable the office to expand its capability for establishing appropriate relationships with granting agencies, disseminating information on funding opportunities to researchers, and otherwise facilitating the conduct of research activities on a campus-wide basis. The new staff member will devote special attention to increasing the amount of external support for the humanities and fine arts.

- As discussed more fully below, plans are underway to establish a research center which will play a major role in facilitating and encouraging research on public policy issues throughout the campus.

In addition to these specific actions, the administration will continue to seek out new sources of funding and take other appropriate steps to encourage research activities of faculty.

Increased Support for Graduate Students

State-appropriated stipends for teaching assistants and graduate assistants at the University at Albany have remained at the same level for six years, and recent reductions in the various forms of State financial aid have only exacerbated the problem. The campus must continue to take the initiative in finding new sources of funding for graduate students and in developing appropriate methods for attracting high quality students to our advanced programs.

A campus-wide task force has been created to study the problems of recruitment and financial aid and to develop a recommended plan of action for the University. This task force, appointed in cooperation with the Graduate Academic Council, is expected to submit its recommendations early in 1977. Our continued development as a major university center will depend to a large extent on our ability to attract and support graduate students of high quality, and we must act now to prevent further erosion of our competitive position.

Increased Non-State Support

As discussed in Part II of this document, there is likely to be little increase in the level of operating support provided by the State in the foreseeable future. Consequently, new financial strategies must be developed to provide increased support from non-State sources to further develop selected programs.

With the help of the SUNYA Foundation, the Benevolent Association, and the Alumni Association, a major effort will be made during 1976-77 to develop such strategies. The Vice President for University Affairs has been assigned primary responsibility for this task, and it is expected that a recommended plan of action will be developed by March, 1977.

Interaction with State Government

Contained in the 1977-78 Final Bud-

get Request of this campus is a proposal to establish a University-wide center for governmental research and services. This Center, to be funded through redeployment of non-instructional resources, will have as its major purpose the enhancement of research on policy issues. The number of permanent staff in the Center will be no more than two or three, and its focus will be on encouraging faculty in the professional schools and in the arts and sciences to work together on substantive policy questions in various areas (e.g., educational policy, the physical environment, business and economic development). A number of rotating appointments will be made available to faculty in order to provide released time for research and achieve more effective coordination of effort. An advisory group of faculty also will be established to enhance the effectiveness of the Center.

In order to achieve its general purpose, the five major goals of the proposed Center will be:

- To stimulate faculty and student research on major issues and problems, by (a) arranging meetings with appropriate public officials, (b) assisting faculty and students in identifying research questions which are appropriate to a university setting, and (c) obtaining support for research from appropriate sources.

- To initiate major research projects and to establish the means for bringing a variety of discipline-based skills to bear on problems of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary character.

- To organize and maintain continuous liaison with agency heads, legislators, and other public officials to identify major issues and problems facing the State.

- To maintain a current University-wide inventory of faculty strengths and areas of expertise and to communicate the existence of such expertise to appropriate groups and individuals.

- To coordinate the development of conferences, workshops, and other appropriate vehicles for sharing knowledge with government officials.

If approved, the center will represent a major vehicle for implementing that element of University mission focusing on public policy analysis.

One step to be taken this year is a series of conferences on campus to identify projects of mutual interest to faculty, on the one hand, and key government officials on the other. These conferences will include workshops and deliberative sessions which focus on key policy issues and the nature of the University-Government interface in addressing those issues.

A second major action to be taken is the appointment of an advisory group to the President. This group will be convened at appropriate intervals to discuss specific needs of State government and the University's role in meeting such needs.

Reduction of Administrative Costs

All campuses of the State University of New York have limited flexibility in the allocation of resources between academic programs and administrative departments. Externally imposed requirements for accountability, for example, have costs associated with them that cannot be avoided. In addition, the budget structure itself limits the degree to which a savings in administrative costs

can be translated into a gain for academic programs. Despite these limitations, we must continually seek ways by which administrative costs can be reduced and the savings redirected to academic programs or to units in direct support thereof.

The Presidential Task Force on Priorities and Resources suggested several alternatives for further study, all of which will be addressed during 1976-77. Some studies are already underway, and several promise to achieve significant cost reductions (e.g., secretarial pooling, elimination of unneeded telephone instruments and lines). A major effort is also underway to automate the operations of some administrative offices. In addition to these special studies, all administrative units are being

urged to reduce costs of present operations to the extent practicable.

In summary, five major areas are identified as priorities for administrative action: more effective facilitation of research; development of increased support for graduate students; development of an increased level of non-State financial support; creation of more effective liaison relationships with State government; and reduction of administrative costs to the extent practicable. Several specific action strategies are indicated in each of these areas, with others to be developed as the planning process evolves.